SINGHI JAINA SERIES

No. 11

PROFESSOR G. BÜHLER'S

THE LIFE OF HEMACANDRĀCĀRYA

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL GERMAN

BY

PROF. DR. MANILAL PATEL, PH. D. (MARBURG)

Vis'va-Bharati, SANTINIKETAN



SINGHI JAINA JÑĀNAPĪṬHA

SANTINIKETAN

ounder
Shri Bahadur singhaji Singhi



General Editor
Shri Jina vijaya Muni

[Price Rs. 3-8.]

स्वर्गवासी साधुचरित श्रीमान् डालचन्दजी सिंघी



जन्म
वि. सं. १९२१, मार्ग वदि ६

स्वर्गवास
वि. सं. १९८४, पोष सुदि ६

SINGHI JAINA SERIES

VOLUME 11



LIFE OF HEMACANDRĀCĀRYA

SINGHI JAINA SERIES

A COLLECTION OF CRITICAL EDITIONS OF MOST IMPORTANT CANONICAL, PHILOSOPHICAL, HISTORICAL, LITERARY, NARRATIVE ETC. WORKS OF JAINA LITERATURE IN PRĀKRIT, SANSKRIT, APABHRAMŚA AND OLD VERNACULAR LANGUAGES, AND STUDIES BY COMPETENT RESEARCH SCHOLARS.

FOUNDED AND PUBLISHED
BY

ŚRĪMĀN BAHĀDUR SIṄGHJĪ SIṄGHĪ OF CALCUTTA

IN MEMORY OF HIS LATE FATHER

ŚRĪ DĀLCANDJĪ SIṄGHĪ.

GENERAL EDITOR

JINAVIJAYA MUNI

ADHIṢṬHĀTĀ: SIṄGHĪ JAINA JÑĀNAPĪṬHA, ŚĀNTINIKETAN.

HONORARY MEMBER OF THE BHANDARKAR ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF POONA AND GUJRAT SAHITYA SABHA OF AHMEDABAD; FORMERLY PRINCIPAL OF GUJRAT PURATATTVAMANDIR OF AHMEDABAD; EDITOR OF MANY SANSKRIT, PRAKRIT, PALI, APABHRAMŚA, AND OLD GUJRATI WORKS.

NUMBER 11

TO BE HAD FROM

SAÑCĀLAKA, SIṄGHĪ JAINA GRANTHAMĀLĀ

BHARATINIVAS,
ELLIS BRIDGE
AHMEDABAD. (GUJRAT)



SIṄGHI SADAN,
48, GARIYAHAT ROAD,
BALLYGUNGE, CALCUTTA

Founded] **[1931. A. D.**

THE

LIFE OF HEMACANDRĀCĀRYA

BY

PROFESSOR DR. G. BÜHLER

VIENNA

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL GERMAN

BY

PROFESSOR DR. MANILAL PATEL, PH. D. (MARBURG)

VIDYĀBHAVANA, VIŚVA-BHĀRATI, ŚĀNTINIKETAN.

WITH A FOREWORD

BY

PROFESSOR DR. M. WINTERNITZ, PH. D.,

PROFESSOR OF INDOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY AT THE GERMAN
UNIVERSITY OF PRAGUE (CZECHOSLOVAKIA),
SOMETIME VISITING PROFESSOR, VIŚVA-BHĀRATI.

PUBLISHED BY

THE ADHIṢṬHĀTĀ - SIṄGHĪ JAINA JÑĀNAPĪṬHA

ŚĀNTINIKETAN.

V. E. 1992] *First Edition, 500 Copies* [1936 A. D.

CONTENTS

PREFACE

The following essay is a translation of the late Professor G. Bühler's original German treatise entitled "Ueber das Leben des Jaina Mönches Hemachandra, des Schülers des Devachandra aus der Vajraśākhā," which appeared in the *Denkschriften der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Vienna, vol. xxxvii (1889), pp. 171-258.[1] Bühler's treatise has since[2] remained the most authentic and thorough biographical statement on the life of Hemacandrācārya (1088[3]-1173 A. D.), the most eminent Jaina (Śvetāmbara) monk and polymath of mediaeval Gujarat. A shrewd and talented exponent of his faith, Hemacandra won himself an undying name in the history of Jainism. He wielded great influence over Jayasiṁha Siddharāja (A. D. 1094-1143), one of the mightiest monarchs of Gujarat, and actually converted his successor, king Kumārapāla, so that the Jaina religion gained a firm footing in Gujarat, which has not been shaken as yet. Hemacandra was, moreover, one of the greatest Indian scholars of all time, whose vast learning and literary labours are sufficient to secure him an honoured place in the history of Indian Philology. His life should indeed be of great appeal and interest, not only to the students of Jainism but also to those of Sanskrit literature and of ancient Indian history and culture. None would therefore dispute the desirability of rescuing Bühler's masterly treatise on the life of Hemacandra from the almost obsolate files of the above-mentioned Viennese journal and of presenting an English version of the same so as to attract a wider circle of readers.

It only remains for me to perform the very pleasant task of expressing my deep gratitude to Muni Jinavijayajī and to Sjt. Bahādur Siṅghjī Siṅghī, the editor and the founder of the *Singhi Jaina Series*, for their kind and helpful interest in my humble literary activities. I am also specially indebted to Professor Dr. M. Winternitz, who not only has kindly written the Foreword to this work but has also carefully read the printed forms in advance and suggested improvements, most of which are incoporated in the *Errata*. To my friend and colleague, Professor Krishna Kripalani, B. A., Bar-at-law, my thanks are due for his kindly going through the MS. with me.

Vidyabhavana,
Visva-Bharati,
SANTINIKETAN,
July, 1936,

M. P.

---

1 Simultaneously also issued as a seperate reprint.

2 See also T. Zachariae, *Die ind. Wörterbucher* (= *GIAP*. i. 3b [1897]), pp. 30-35; H. Jacobi, *ERE*. vol. vi, p. 591; J. Hertel, *Ausgewählte Erzählungen aus Hemacandras Paris'iṣṭaparvan*, Leipzig (1908), Einleitung, pp. 1-5.

3 According to Jacobi's calculation the birthdate of Hemacandra would be the 1st December, 1088 A D., see Hertel, *ibid*. p. 1, n. 2.

PREFACE BY THE GENERAL EDITOR.

Professor George Bühler was one of those great German scholars to whom largely goes the credit for the development of the science of Indology. His whole life was dedicated to the study and research of ancient Indian history and literature. Indian archeology and epigraphy are greatly indebted to this scholar for his contributions. He brought to bear upon these subjects a trained and unbiassed mind. His study of the history and literature of the Jaina religion was specially painstaking and sympathetic. Prof. Herman Jacobi derived great support from the researches of Dr. Bühler in refuting the view of Prof. Weber that Jainism was merely a sect of Buddhism and in establishing the antiquity and the independance of Jainism as a religious sect. Dr. Bühler's researches on the Jaina stupa at Mathura and inscriptions thereon deserve special mention.

He was the first scholar to discuss critically and exhaustively, as far as the material available to him allowed, the life and times of Hemacandra - one of the greatest figures of the Jaina Church. Dr. Bühler when an officer in the Educational Department of the Bombay Government had rare opportunities of visiting and examining some of the famous Jaina Bhandars of Gujrat and Rajputana. These investigations provided him with ample material which enabled him to prepare the present study on Hemacandra. He possessed that acumen and insight which made him appreciate the proper historical value of such Prabandha works as the *Prabhāvakacarita* and the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi.*

The present study on the life of Hemacandra was first published in German language about fifty years back. Since that time much new material has been discovered which throws considerable light on the problems which were then obscure to this learned scholar.

The material on which he had to rely was then only in the form of MSS. which were defective in many ways. Most of it is now more or less critically edited and published. All the works of Hemacandra himself were also not available to him in properly edited and printed form. So it is but natural that in the light of this new and more adequate material some discrepancies should be discovered in this learned study.

Of the new material, that has been discovered since Dr. Bühler published his study, the *Kumārapālapratibodha* of Somaprabhācārya should be mentioned first. This work was completed in the year V. S. 1241 (= A.D. 1185) that is eleven years after the death of Hemacandra. It was composed and finished by Somaprabhācārya while residing at Aṇahillapura in the *vasati* (that is the residence) of the poet-laureate Śripāla. Three disciples of Hemacandra–namely Mahendra muni, Vardhamāna muni and Guṇacandra gaṇi–had attended to it with great interest as it was being read to them. The first copies of the work were prepared by the order of Abhayakumāra–a leading rich citizen of Aṇahillapura and a favourite of Kumārapāla. Thus this book is the work of a contemporary learned man who was in close contact of Hemacandra and his pupils and devotees. Though this work is voluminous, unfortunately it does not give as much information about the lives of Kumārapāla and Hemacanra as to satisfy our expectations. However whatever information it gives is quite reliable and of first class historical importance. Dr. Bühler was altogether unaware of this work.

Next to this comes the *Moharājaparājaya* nāṭaka of Yasaḥpāla a contemporary of Hemacandra and Kumārapāla. Dr. Bühler was aware of this drama and had taken notice of it, but it appears he had not himself gone through this work. If he had availed himself of both these works he would have been able to give a more accurate and satisfactory account of the conversion of Kumārapāla by Hemacandra.

In addition to these two literary works we have been fortunate enough to discover other historical references which help us in understanding more clearly and definitely matters which were regarded by Dr. Bühler as doubtful or incapable of a consistent explanation. For example, take the year of the conquest of Mālava by Siddharāja. Now we have discovered certain colophons at the end of MSS. which help us in settling this question. Again Dr. Bühler has raised many doubts as to the reliability of the evidence which goes to show the influence of other learned Jaina Ācāryas on Siddharāja (Chapt. IV p. 33). These doubts get solved by the *praśasti* of V. S. 1193 at the end of the *Munisuvrataswāmicarita* of Candrasūri which is published in the fifth report of Prof. Peterson (pp. 7-18).

It appears that Dr. Bühler could not go through all the works of Hemacandra carefully. Otherwise some of the mistakes could have been avoided. For example Bühler says:– "In none of his works, known so far, does Hemcandra give the name, of his teacher, although ample opportunity should have been offered for the same." (p. 10) It is rather strange that Dr. Bühler should pass such a remark. In fact, in the *Triṣaṣṭiś'alākāpuruṣacarītra* from whose 10th parvan he gives copious quotations, Hemacandra not only refers to his Guru but says that it was through his prasāda (blessings) that he could be so rich in learning.* As Dr. Bühler probably could not

* शिष्यस्तस्य च तीर्थमेकमवनेः पावित्र्यकृज्जङ्गमं स्याद्वादत्रिदशापगाहिमगिरिर्विश्वप्रबोधार्यमा ।
कृत्वा स्थानकवृत्ति–शान्तिचरिते प्राप्तः प्रसिद्धिं परां सूरिर्भूरितपःप्रभाववसतिः श्रीदेवचन्द्रोऽभवत् ॥ १४ ॥
आचार्यो हेमचन्द्रोऽभूत्तत्पादाम्बुजषट्पदः । तत्प्रसादादधिगतज्ञानसम्पन्महोदयः ॥ १५ ॥

त्रिषष्टिशलाकापुरुषचरित्र, पर्व १०, प्रशस्ति ।

read this huge Jaina Epic by Hemacandra he could not properly appreciate the poetic gifts of the great Ācārya. Dr. Bühler does not seem to have read carefully the *Chandonus'āsana* of Hemacandra - a work on metrics - otherwise he would not have said that the work does not contain verses in praise of Siddharāja (p. 36). The Vṛatti has verses both in praise of Kumārapāla as well as Siddharāja. Dr. Bühler's estimate of Hemacandra's grammar is also defective. He says—"The grammar does not, it is true, contain 125,000 *S'lokas,* as Merutuṅga would have us believe. But including the commentaries and the appendices which, in their turn, have commentaries, it has something like 20,000 to 30,000 *S'lokas.*" (p. 18). There is enough evidence to support the opinion of Merutuṅga that the *Siddha-Hema* grammar consists of 125000 ślokas. Hemacandra himself, wrote a *Bṛhannyāsa* resembling the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali. From older references we learn that this Nyāsa alone consisted of 80-84000 verses. Unfortunately a great part of this Nyāsa appears to be lost. A few fragments of this Nyāsa are, however, found in old Jaina Bhaṇḍāras. These alone amount to about 20000 to 25000 verses. The *Sūtrapāṭha,* the *Laghuṭīkā,* the *Bṛhaṭṭīkā,* the *Dhātupāṭha,* the *Uṇādipāṭha,* the *Liṅgānus'āsana* etc. of this grammar, which are mostly printed and published, consist of no less than fifty thousand ślokas.

Dr. Bühler confuses the *Pramāṇamīmānsā* of Hemacandra with the *Syādvāda-mañjarī* which is in reality a commentary by Malliṣena on the *Anyayoga-vyavacchedadvātrins'ikā* - a hymn of 32 verses - by Hemcandra. This *Pramāṇamīmānsā* is incomplete. There is reason to believe that this was probably his last work.

Thus one finds that Dr. Bühler's account of the life of Hemacandra requires to be revised and corrected at several places in the light of new material. I cannot give here all such revisions and corrections with relevant evidence, for the fear that it might double the bulk of the volume. Again it is in the fitness of things that I should leave this study which has become a classic on the subject as it is.

* * *

My attention was first drawn to this learned study on the life of Hemacandra in the year 1915-16 when I was engaged in editing the *Kumārapālapratibodha* of Somaprabhācārya, by my late lamented friend Mr. C. D. Dalal the originator and the first editor of the G.O.S. As I did not then know German I had to wait for two years before I got the substance of it at Poona through a German-knowing friend of mine. I was so impressed with its importance as a contribution on the subject that I thought of getting it translated into English and published in a handy form. Incidentally Mr. Moticand G. Kapadia of Bombay, who also came to learn of the importance of this work, expressed his desire to defray the expenses of the translation work. I entrusted the work to Miss. Kohn who is quite at home in both German and English. This translation

however, remained with Mr. Kapadia for a number of years without being published. I, however, desired that this valuable work should be made accessible to scholars who do not know German and who are interested in the subject. During my stay at Vis'vabhārati Śantiniketan, I talked to my friend Dr. Manibhai Patel, of my intention. He readily agreed to prepare an English rendering of this study and enthusiastically carried out the work. Thus after twenty years I had the satisfaction of making this work accessible to scholars in the English garb in the *Singhi Jaina series.*

It is a matter of great pleasure to me that the learned and famous scholar Prof. M. Winternitz, the worthy *S'isya* of Dr. Bühler has contributed an excellent foreword to this English rendering of his *Guru's* work. Our best thanks — of myself and of Babu Bahādursinghaji, the noble founder of this series — are due to him for this kindness.

BHARATI—NIVASA,
AHAMEDABAD.

JINA VIJAYA.

FOREWORD

Kalikālasarvajña, "The Omniscient of the Kali Age", was the title given to the great Jaina monk Hemacandra by his co-religionists, and he well deserved this title and his fame, on account of the astounding many-sidedness of his literary achievements. He was indeed one of the most versatile and prolific writers, both as a poet and as a scholar. It is due to him that Gujarat became a main stronghold of the Śvetāmbara Jainas and has remained so for centuries, and that Jaina literature flourished there particularly in the 12th and 13th centuries. By his influence on the two Caulukya kings Jayasiṁha Siddharāja, and Kumārapāla he was able to direct, in some measure, the destinies and the cultural progress of his native country. But not only Gujarat and the Jaina community owe a great debt of gratitude to Hemacandra, he has also a place of honour in general Sanskrit literature as a compiler of useful and important works on grammar, lexicography, poetics and metrics.

Among his poetical works his huge epic on the "Lives of the Sixty-three Excellent Men" (*Triṣaṣṭi-S'alākāpuruṣa-Carita*) is perhaps best known. Though not without merit as a work of poetry, a Mahākāvya, as it is described by the author himself, yet its main purpose is instruction and edification. For us it is invaluable as a storehouse of ancient legendary lore and tradition. The appendix to this work, the *Paris'iṣṭa-Parvan*, also called "Lives of the Series of Elders" (*Sthavirāvali-Carita*) is even more important by its wealth of folklore and stories of all kinds. He has preserved to us many popular proverbs, and in one of his stories even folk-songs in dialect.

As a devout Jaina he also composed some hymns of praise (*Stotras*). His "Hymn to the Passionless (Mahāvīra)", the *Vītarāgastotra*, is at the same time a poetical manual of the Jaina religion.

Hemacandra is always more of a scholar and a moralist than a poet, though not without taste and considerable skill in the use of the Kāvya style. This is also shown by his didactic poem, the *Yogas'āstra*, consisting of a text in simple ślokas and a commentary in the style of ornate poetry, containing also stories.

As a poet, as a historian in some way, and as a grammarian, all at the same time, Hemacandra proved himself in the *one* epic poem *Kumārapāla-Carita*, also known as *Dvyās'raya-Kāvya*, because it is written in two languages, Sanskrit and Prakrit. The

poem describes the history of the Caulukyas of Aṇhilvāḍ and more especially of Kumārapāla, the author's great patron, but at the same time it is intended to illustrate the rules of his own Sanskrit and Prakrit grammars.

Hemacandra's grammar, called *Siddhahemacandra* or *Haimavyākaraṇa*, though hardly more than an improved edition of Śākaṭāyana's grammar, has yet been described by F. Kielhorn as "the best grammar of the Indian middle ages" on account of its practical arrangement and terminology. He also added himself a commentary and both *Uṇādigaṇasūtra* and *Dhātupāṭha* to his grammar. Like other grammarians he also wrote a *Liṅgānus'āsana.* The eighth chapter of his *Siddhahemacandra* is devoted to Prakrit grammar, which is still the most important grammar of the Prakrit dialects we possess. In his Prakrit grammar he has shown again his interest in popular poetry by preserving for us some pretty Apabhraṃśa songs which closely resemble the songs in Hāla's *Sattasaī.* In his manual of metrics he even composed Apabhraṃśa songs himself in illustration of the Apabhraṃśa metres, and it seems to be due to Hemacandra, as Professor H. D. Velankar (*Annals Bhandarkar Inst.* 14, p. 15) has suggested, that Apabhraṃśa has become a literary language among Jaina Yatis.

Hemacandra's learned books, it is true, are not distinguished by any great originality, but they display a truly encyclopaedic erudition and an enormous amount of reading, besides a practical sense which makes them very useful. This applies also to his manuals of poetics and metrics, the *Kāvyānus'āsana* and the *Chandonus'āsana,* each accompanied by the author's own commentary.

Of the greatest importance for Sanskrit lexicography are the two works of Hemacandra on this subject, his synonymic lexicon *Abhidhānacintāmaṇimālā* with a commentary by the author himself, and his homonymic lexicon *Anekārthasaṃgraha,* with a commentary by the author's pupil Mahendrasūri. A supplement to the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* is the *Nighaṇṭus'eṣa,* a glossary of botanical terms in 396 ślokas. Of inestimable value is his Prakrit lexicon *Des'īnāmamālā.* All these lexicons are so very valuable, because Hemacandra was able to use sources which are lost to us, as also on account of their practical arrangement and the clear explanations.

Hemacandra's literary activity also extended to philosophy. He wrote a work on logic, the *Pramāṇa-Mīmāṃsā,* "Examination of the Means of Proof," again with his own commentary. And his *Anyayogavyavacchedadvātriṃs'ikā,* 32 verses in praise of Mahāvīra and a treatise on logic at the same time, formed the basis for *Malliṣeṇa's Syādvādamañjarī,* which is not only a commentary on Hemacandra's treatise, but also an independent work on Jaina philosophy.[1]

---

1 Until a short time ago it was believed that Hemacandra is also the author of a *Laghv-Arhannītis'āstra,* a Jaina work on law and politics, said to be a summary of a larger work in Prākrit, and published with a Gujarati commentary at Ahmedabad, 1906. But Mr. C. R. Jain (see *The Jaina Gazette,* January 1935, pp. 9ff.) assures us, on the authority of Mr. Puran Chand Nahar, that this "Arhannīti" is a spurious work of the 19th century. It is no loss to the fame of Hemacandra, if we have to omit this insignificant compilation from the list of his works.

It was my revered *Guru*, the late George Bühler, one of the pioneers of Jinistic studies, who first drew the attention of scholars to the works of Hemacandra and their importance for the history of Indian literature. His Life of Hemacandra, though written as far back as 1889, far from being antiquated, is still the most authentic work on the life of the great Jaina monk. More than that, Bühler's treatise cannot be too strongly recommended to every student of Indian history as a perfect model of historical research. No one has shown better than Bühler, how works of the Prabandha type, such as Prabhācandra's *Prabhāvakacaritra*, Merutuṅga's *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, and Rājaśekhara's *Prabandhakos'a*,[2] full of legends and worthless anecdotes as they are, may yet, by a careful critical investigation, be used as sources of history.

It was, therefore, a great pleasure to me, when Dr. Manilal Patel, Professor in the Vidyābhavana, Viśva-Bhāratī, informed me that he had translated Bühler's classical essay into English, and that it was to form a volume in the excellent *Singhi Jaina Series* published by the Rev. Jinavijaya Muni, from Viśva-Bhāratī, Śāntiniketan, and I am happy to be able to introduce this important work from the pen of my *Guru* in its new garb which will make it accessible to fellow-students who have hitherto been unable to read it in the original German.

M. WINTERNITZ.

2 The *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* and the *Prabandhakos'a* have lately been published in excellent editions by Jinavijaya Muni, Siṅghi Professor of Jaina Culture at Vis'va-Bhāratī, Śāntiniketan, in the *Singhi Jaina Series*, where also an edition of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* is in preparation.

THE LIFE OF HEMACANDRA

CHAPTER I

The Sources

ALTHOUGH European Orientalists have, during the last 50 years, paid very close attention to the works of Hemacandra, there still remains the want of a thorough research in the life of this remarkable man who, through his extensive literary activity, made the name of the Śvetāmbaras universally known in the learned circles of India, and who, because of his influence over a mighty monarch of Gujarat during the second half of the 12th century, gained a predominant place for the Jaina doctrine for the time being in his own native land. Apart from the inadequate, and partly inaccurate, data in H. H. Wilson's works and in the prefaces to the editions of some of Hemacandra's works, the only detailed account of the life of this famous monk is found in K. Forbes' *Rās Mālā*, (second edition, Bombay, 1878) pp. 145-157. A short article by Bhau Daji in the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. IX, p. 222f., is intended to supplement this account. Forbes' narrative is essentially a reproduction of the informations found in Merutuṅgācārya's *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*. The anecdotes contained in this last-named work are put in a better chronological order, while the most striking improbabilities are set aside. At the end, some legends are appended which are taken from the oral tradition. This treatment of the material corresponds to the character of Forbes' work which makes no claim to give a critical adaptation of the history of Gujarat, but has as its title "A Garland of Historical Legends".

Since the year 1856, when the *Rās Mālā* appeared, the systematic research carried on in the Jaina-Libraries in Western India has brought to light a large mass of new material for the life of Hemacandra. On the one hand, numerous works, such as *Prabhāvakacaritra, Prabandhakos'a,* Commentaries on the *Ṛṣimaṇḍalastotra,* and a number of *Kumārapālacaritas* or *Kumārarāsas* have been discovered which deat more or less in detail with the life of this 'spiritual head of the *Kaliyuga*'; on the other hand, Hemacandra's own works, probably all of them and almost in complete form, are now accessible. It is therefore now possible to examine critically the information obtained through the secondary sources by comparing them with one another and with Hemacandra's own utterances—these are, alas! very rare—about his person and life-experiences. The character of these secondary sources, as well as the fact that the greater number of them were written long after Hemacandra's time and that they belong to the 14th, 15th and 16th centuries, renders it unnecessary to consider them collectively. A selection is quite sufficient, as the later authors for the most part only copy what their predecessors wrote.

For the following research I have used:

1. The *Prabhāvakacaritra*, a collection of life-sketches of 22 Jaina *Ācāryas*, who bestowed glory on thier faith; it was written about 1250, about 80 years after Hemacandra's death, by Prabhācandra and Pradyumnasūri.[1]

2. The *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* by Merutuṅgācārya of Vardhamānapura or Vaḍhavāṇ in Kāṭhiāvaḍ: a collection of historical legends, completed on the full-moon day of the Vaiśākha month, Vikrama Saṁvat 1362, that is, in April-May 1305 or 1306 A.D.[2]

3. The *Prabandhakoṣa* by Rājaśekhara: a collection of the biographies of famous monks, poets and statesmen completed in Ḍhilli or Delhi, Vikrama Saṁvat 1405, i. e. 1348–49 A. D.[3]

4. The *Kumārapālacarita* by Jinamaṇḍana Upādhyāya, a life-story of the King Kumārapāla of Gujarat V. S. 1199-1230, completed in Vikrama Saṁvat 1492, i. e. 1435–6 A. D.[4]

The relationship of these works with one another is as follows: The *Prabhāvakacaritra* and the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* represent two distinct—and apparently independent of each other—currents of tradition. They diverge very often and, as regards some parts, they do so in many important points; the older work gives us in some cases less trustworthy data. The author of the *Prabandhakoṣa* knows the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* and regards his own account of Hemacandra as an appendix to the same. He says he will not repeat what is said in that work (*Prabandhacintāmaṇi*); he will, on the contrary, acquaint his readers with a number of unknown anecdotes.[5] The material put forth by him is, it is true, generally not to be found in earlier works and appears to have been adapted from tradition to which he so often refers. Lastly, the *Kumārapālacarita* is a loose compilation from the three first-named and from several other similar works. Here and there, contradictory accounts of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* and of the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*

have been placed side by side; in other cases, attempts have been made to bring them in accord by alterations. These repetitions have, of course, no great worth, except when Jinamaṇḍana's method of broader representation is instrumental to a better understanding of the notes of his predecessors which were sometimes too brief. His extracts from some older and hardly accessible works are, on the other hand, of greater value,-particularly those from the *Moharājaparājaya*, a drama which Yaśaḥpāla, a councillor or a minister of the 'Emperor' Ajayadeve, i. e. of the king Ajayapāla of Gujarat, wrote in honour of Kumārapāla's conversion to Jainism.[6] As Ajayapāla reigned immediately after Kumārapāla and sat on the throne only for three years, the informations given in the drama deserve serious attention as being those of a contemporary source.

Like all the *Caritras* and *Prabandhas*, even the oldest of the works enumerated are not purely historical sources; nor are they comparable to the European Chronicles of the Middle Ages or to those of the Arabs. On the whole they are sectarian writings and when using them, one must take into account not only the tendencies of the sect from which they emanate, but also other minor details and some peculiarities of the Indian character. According to the definition which Rājaśekhara gives in his introduction to the *Prabandhakoṣa*,[7] the *Caritras* of the Jainas are the biographies of the Tīrthaṅkaras or Prophets—the ancient, whole-or half-mythical Emperors of India who are occasionally called *Cakravartin*—and of the Seers, i. e. the great, ancient chiefs of the sects down to Ārya-Rakṣita who must have died in the year 557 after Vīra or 30 A. D. According to him, the stories of men of later times, monks as well as laymen, are designated as 'Prabandha'. The motives with which the *Caritras* and the *Prabandhas* were written, are to edify the congregations, to convince them of the magnificence and the might of the Jaina faith and to supply the monks with the material for their sermons, or, when the subject is purely of worldly interest, to provide the public with pleasant entertainment. Metrical works of this class were written always according to the rules of the Brahmanical poetics and were meant to exhibit the artistic skill and scholarship of the authors. As the authors start out with this point of view before them, they naturally make their works collections of interesting anecdotes serving their purpose rather than actual biographies or exact accounts of events in the past. They move almost always by leaps and bounds and often leave very important points entirely in darkness. At the same time, their information often betrays strong, intentional colouring in the interest of their own faith; whereas in other places poetic exaggerations or devices which are to make the story piquant, may easily be detected. Other circumstances which render it more difficult for us to ascertain the historical valuation of the *Caritras* and the *Prabandhas* are the uncertainty of their original sources which for the major part consist of the oral tradition of the schools of the monks or of the bards and of the fearful belief in miracles and superstitions which were perhaps more deep-rooted in the Indians than in the European peoples of the Middle Ages.

The authors of the *Prabandhas* admit most of the points referred to above, thereby themselves admitting their main weaknesses. Thus, Rājaśekhara says in the Introduction to the *Prabandhakoṣa*, whilst at the same time giving interesting advice to the preachers of his faith:

"Here the pupil must humbly study everything, as prescribed, under a teacher

who has crossed the ocean of the holy scripture and eagerly fulfils his religious duties. Then for the salvation of the pious ones, he must deliver that sermon which stills the agony of sin; and the prescription for the same is this: the holy scripture must be read without committing any mistake, without contracting words, without omitting syllables. The explanation of the same should be given in a noble, sweet speech. Duly protecting one's body and looking round upon those who have gathered, one must speak so long as the matter is understood. *The speaker can generally attain his aim with the Caritras and the Prabandhas.*"

Still greater details are given by Merutuṅga in the Introduction to the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, verses 5-7, as to the purpose of his work and the character of his sources[8]:

5. 'The famous Gaṇin Guṇacandra has produced the first copy of the new work, the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, which is so lovely as the *Mahābhārata*'.

6. 'The old tales do not delight the hearts of the shrewd so much, for they have heard the same very often; I am therefore compiling the book *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* with (the use of) biographies (of my time) of noble men who are nearer to us.'

7. 'Even if the tales which the wise tell according to their understanding necessarily become different in character, clever people should, however, not criticize this work maliciously, as it rests on a good tradition'.

Thus, Merutuṅga confesses that his chief purpose was to entertain his public and that there were several contradictory accounts in existence as to the persons and events described by him. He is quite conscious of the uncertainty of the foundation on which his building rests. His grounds of consolation are of very doubtful worth.

These confessions and the fact that besides obvious absurdities, a large number of anachronisms, omissions and other errors occur in all the parts of the *Prabandhas*, which can be controlled by the accounts of authentic sources, make it essential for one to take the greatest precaution when using them. They should not, however, lead one to a complete rejection of the accounts contained therein; for the *Prabandhas* do contain much that is well corroborated by the inscriptions and other reliable sources. Particularly one must admit that the persons appearing in the older as well as later (*Prabandhas*) are all historical. However often a person is placed too early or too late, or the most contrary things are said about him, yet there is not a single instance in which one can with certainty assume that a particular man mentioned by him be a creation of the author's imagination. On the contrary, almost every new inscription, every collection of old manuscripts, and each newly discovered historical work supplies evidence for the actual existence of one or other of the personalities mentioned by them. So also those dates which they give as exact deserve always our most earnest consideration. Whenever these occur in other works of this class, which are usually independent of one another, we may without any hesitation accept them as historically correct. Naturally the same is also the case with other information. It will be seen from what follows that all the statements about Hemacandra in the *Prabhāvakacaritra* as also in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* which are not from the outset doubtful because of their character, are completely correct. On

the whole, however, it must be admitted that even in the *Prabhāvakacaritra* Hemacandra has become a semi-mythical personality. Considering the character of the *Prabandhas* described above, Hemacandra's own statements about his person and his time are naturally of the greatest significance. They are principally to be found:

1. In the Sanskrit *Dvyās'rayamahākāvya,* which gives a summary of the History of the Caulukya dynasty of Gujarat, from Mūlarāja down to Kumārapāla (Note 28);

2. In the Prakrit *Dvyās'rayamahākāvya* or *Kumāravālcariya* which celebrates his patron Kumārapāla (Note 88);

3. In the *Pras'asti* to his Grammar which is written in honour of his first patron Jayasiṁha Siddharāja and the ancestors of the same (Note 33);

4. In the *Mahāvīracarita* which belongs to the *Triṣaṣṭis'alākāpuruṣacaritra* (Note 66).

Besides, isolated facts are found scattered in almost all of his works. Without these authentic communications, a research into Hemacandra's life would yield results of little certainty. With the help of them, at least an outline of his biography can be drawn. There remain, however, significant gaps which cannot be filled up for the present.

CHAPTER II

Hemacandra's Youth

Hemacandra's birthplace was, according to all accounts, Dhandhukā, a town which was very important in former times and is even now not insignificant. It belongs to the district of Ahmedabad and lies[9] just on the frontier between the main land of Gujarat and the peninsula of Kāṭhiāvāḍ. There, in 1145 V.S., he was born on the full-moon night of the month of Kārttika, that is, in November–December, 1088 or 1089 A. D.[10] His parents, Cāciga and Pāhinī, belonged to the merchant (*Vāṇiā*) caste; in particular to that sub-caste which is known as Śrīmoḍh Vāṇiās,[11] so called because this sub-caste originally came from Moḍherā. Both the parents adhered to the doctrine of Jina. Pāhinī distinguished herself through her special zeal for the faith and was moved by her piety to hand over her son whose worldly name was Cāṅgadeva or Caṅgadeva,[12] to a monk named Devacandra as a pupil while still in his early childhood, and thus dedicated him to the spiritual order. The detailed circumstances which led Cāṅgadeva enter the order of the Yatis, are variously described and all the stories are more or less romantically adorned. The *Prabhāvakacaritra* gives only a short account. Pāhinī, so it says, once dreamed that she had presented the *Cintāmaṇi* (the stone that fulfils all wishes) to her spiritual adviser. She related her dream to the monk Devacandra who gave her an explanation that she would bear a son who "would resemble the Kaustubha-jewel of the ocean of the Jaina-doctrine." When Cāṅgadeva was five years old, he accompanied his mother to the temple and sat on the seating-cushion of Devacandra while she was performing her worship. The monk reminded her of the dream and bade her entrust the boy to him as his pupil. Pāhinī referred him first to the child's father. As Devacandra kept silence over this, she fulfilled his wish, though unwillingly, "because she remembered the dream and because the word of the Teacher must not be disregarded." Thereupon, Devacandra took the boy with him to Stambhatīrtha, the present-day Cambay. There he was first consecrated in the temple of Pārśvanātha on Saturday, the fourteenth day of the bright half of the month Māgha of the Vikrama-year 1150. On this occasion, the 'famous' Udayana held the usual festival. Cāṅgadeva received the name Somacandra.[13]

Merutuṅga is much more extensive. He differs in some not unessential points from the *Prabhāvakacaritra* and presents quite a complete little romance. According to him, Devacandra came to Dhandhukā on his journey from Pattana or Aṇhilvāḍ and went into the Temple connected with a monastery of Śrīmoḍh merchants, in order to pay his homage to the image of Jina there. Cāṅgadeva, about eight years old, who roamed here and there playing with other companions of the same age, came there and sat down on Devacandra's resting-cushion which lay on the "throne" of the ordinary pulpit of the Jaina-monasteries. He thereby attracted the attention of the monk who on closer observation, found the boy to be endowed with signs of a high destiny. Wishing to get him as his pupil, the monk gathered together the congregation, i. e. the most esteemed Jaina merchants of the city, and went with them to the house of Cāciga. The father was absent from the house, but his wife Pāhinī received the monk and his companions in a fitting manner. Devacandra told her that the congregation had come there in order to beg from her, her son. Although moved to tears by the honour so done to her, Pāhinī at first declared herself unable to respond to the request, as her husband was of "heretical" mind and was, moreover, absent. At last the pressure of her relatives prevailed upon her and she handed the boy over to the Guru on their responsibility. Also Cāṅgadeva, who was consulted according to the rules, consented to become a pupil of the monk. Thereupon Devacandra immediately resumed his wandering with Cāṅgadeva and went to Karṇāvatī where he took the boy to the house of a royal minister, named Udayana. Without doubt he was afraid that his pupil might be taken back from him. He sought therefore to secure the shelter of an influential member of the Jaina congregation. Subsequent events showed that he was not in the wrong; for there soon appeared Cāciga who, after he returned from his journey, at once hurried to Karṇāvatī in order to take Cāṅgadeva back. The father had taken a vow not to take any food until he had seen his son. Having arived there, he went to the dwelling place of the monk, so furions that he showed the latter scant reverence and would not be soothed. It was only when Udayana was approached and he intervened, that the father was reconciled. Udayana took him to his house, treated him with honour as an elder brother and entertained him hospitably. Then he sent for Cāṅgadeva, placed him in the lap of his father whom he offered a large sum of money besides other gifts of honour. Cāciga proudly declined the presents; but was so moved by the honour done to him by his host that he consented to let him have his son. On further pursuation by Udayana, he also allowed him to transfer his rights to Devacandra and finally performed the rite of world-renunciation for Cāṅgadeva.[14]

A third version which agrees neither with the *Prabhāvakacaritra* nor with Merutuṅga, is given by Rājaśekhara. According to this, Devacandra often went to Dhandhukā on his journeys and preached there. One day, Nemināga, one of the believers among the gathering stood up and said that Cāṅgadeva, the son of his sister Pāhiṇī and of Ṭhakkura Cācika, had received spiritual awakening through the sermon and was begging to be ordained as a monk. Before his birth (he further said) his mother had seen in a dream a mango-tree which, when transplanted to another spot, had borne rich fruits. Thereupon Devacandra declared that the petitioner would, if he entered the spiritual order, perform great deeds: he was endowed with lucky marks and was worthy to be

ordained, but the consent of his parents must be obtained. When Cāṅgadeva's wish was put before his parents, they first of all opposed, but finally gave their consent to it.[15]

Lastly, the author of the *Kumārapālacarita* gives both the first and the second stories with some embellishments and weaves them together in his own way, without troubling himself about the contradictions. Thus he declares thrice that Cāṅgadeva was born in the year 1145 of the Vikrama-era, but he twice gives as the date of his ordination the year 1150, i. e. the fifth year of his life, in agreement with the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, and once gives the date Vikrama Saṁvat 1154, i. e. the ninth year of his life, in accordance with Merutuṅga. According to his assumption, Cāṅgadeva received the name Somadeva after his ordination. He adds that the form Somacandra is used "by some".[16]

Evidently the story of the *Kumārapālacarita* deserves no consideration. Also the account of Rājaśekhara is not trustworthy, for he betrays his desire to prove that Hemacandra entered the holy order in strictest accordance with the doctrine of the sacred scriptures of the Jainas. According to these doctrines, only he is worthy to become a monk who, enlightened through the sermon and through his own meditation, is convinced of the futility of the world and feels the intense longing for eternal salvation, the *Mukti*. In reality, the facts work somewhat differently. If the order of the Yatis were allowed to recruit members only from the volunteers who desired to renounce the world, then it would be in a bad position and the Jaina-congregation would be short of preachers. The provision of the necessary recruits is generally secured by the rich members of the congregation buying up boys, still in their tenderest age, from their parents and entrusting them to the Yatis for instruction. Illegitimate children of Brahmin widows are given special preference as they can be cheaply bought and may be supposed to have spiritual aptitude, for often the fathers of such children belong to the most cultured castes of India. In this matter not seldom does it happen that children of poor Brahmins or Vāṇiās are bought especially in times of high cost of living. In some isolated cases the Yatis themselves are active and make sure of successors by adopting forsaken orphans or by begging from their co-religionists children to whom they take fancy.[17] These conditions of the present day clearly show that Rājaśekhara's account is an invention, especially because the contradictory statements of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* and of Merutuṅga agree with the first-named. It is for the same reason that one must declare as perfectly trustworthy the statement that Devacandra obtained Cāṅgadeva by begging him from his mother. It is in every way probable that a monk who was attracted by an intelligent boy, 'endowed with lucky marks', sought to get him as a pupil and gained his purpose by cleverly exploiting the piety and the weakness of the mother. The story of the dream and of its interpretation before the birth of the boy as found in the *Prabhāvakacaritra* is, of course, to be rejected as an outcome of the belief, so often repeated by the Jainas, that the birth of great men is predicted to mothers by dreams.

In the same way, little value can be attached to the assertion in both the oldest sources, that Cāṅgadeva sat on the cushion of the monk. On the other hand, it is probably correct that Cāciga opposed and attempted to bring his son back, as related by Merutuṅga. If he was, as Merutuṅga says, "of heretical mind", that is, though belonging to the Jaina congregation, he still adhered to the old views, then one can easily understand his opposition against his son's entering the Yati's order. He was probably possessed by

the belief of the orthodox Indian who expects eternal happiness in heaven by the regular performance of sacrifices offered to the *manes* by his male successor and who, therefore, regards as the greatest ill-luck the untimely entrance of the latter into the holy order. Little as these viewpoints agree with Jainism, they are not seldom found among the Jaina laymen who, even though they do not perform sacrifices offered to the *manes*, still do share orthodox Indians' feelings for their male offspring. Similarly, there is no reason to doubt the statement that Udayana intervened between the monk and Cāciga. Udayana is certainly a historical personality. He was a Srīmālī Vāṇiā who emigrated into Gujarat from Śrīmāl or Bhīnmāl in Mārvāḍ. He is supposed to have settled down first of all in the city of Karṇāvatī, which took, according to K. Forbes, the place of modern Ahmedabad. Soon afterwards, he was appointed Mantrin or royal counsel in Stambhatīrtha by Siddharāja-Jayasiṁha and probably occupied the post of a Civil Governor in that city.[18] He is referred to repeatedly in Hemacandra's biography. Also the short remark in the *Prabhāvakacaritra* that the famous Udayana had performed the ceremony of Cāṅgadeva's ordination in Cambay, points to the fact that Merutuṅga was correct in representing Udayana as Devacandra's patron. If this is so, then we have also a solution of the contradictions in both the oldest sources regarding Cāṅgadeva's age at the time of his ordination and regarding the city where it took place. As regards the first point, Merutuṅga, and as regards the second point, the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, is in the right. For, it is in itself improbable that Cāṅgadeva was ordained to become a monk in his fifth year, in V. S. 1150. This becomes quite unbelievable when we are told that Udayana at that time was already a royal counsel or was living in Cambay, because the king Jayasiṁha, in whose reign he emigrated into Gujarat, ascended the throne only in the Vikrama year 1150. Consequently Merutuṅga's date for the ordination,–the eighth or ninth year of his life, according to Jinamaṇḍana, the Vikrama year 1154–has decidedly an advantage. On the other hand, the place where the ceremony was performed, must be Cambay and not Karṇāvatī. In addition, it may be adduced that the *Prabhāvakacaritra* further remarks that Kumārapāla, after his conversion had a Dīkṣāvihāra, i. e. a temple with a monastery, built in Cambay, in memory of Hemacandra's ordination. Merutuṅga agrees with this fact, despite his earlier contradictory statement.[19]

The sources supply us with little information regarding the next twelve years of the life of Hemacandra, or more properly Somacandra, which he spent as a student and servant of his Guru. Definite statements are to be found only in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*. There it is stated that he studied Logic and Dialectics as well as Grammar and Poetics and that he mastered these subjects at once on account of the power of his intelligence "which shone clear and pure as light". It is of course in itself clear that Somacandra learnt these branches of Brahmanical lore only as a supplement to the theology of the Jainas. For, his training as a teacher and preacher of the Jaina-faith necessitated, naturally, above all, intimate knowledge of the Prakrit-dialect in which the Jaina-*sūtras* are written, as also a thorough study of the latter, of their commentaries and of other scriptures related thereto. His later scholarly attainments show that the statement of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* as to his capacities is right and that he must indeed have possessed more than ordinary power of intellect. There is no mention as to whether Devacandra alone instructed him or whether he had other teachers as well. The first assumption is,

2

however, not improbable, as Devacandra appears to have been a man of no insignificance. Devacandra is of course not mentioned in the lists of teachers. On the other hand, Rājaśekhara assumes that he belonged to the Pūrṇacandra Gaccha and to the line of Yaśobhadra, the Rāṇā of Vaṭapadra, who was converted by Dattasūri, and that Yaśobhadra's pupil was Pradyumnasūri, the author of many works and his pupil Guṇasena was Devacandra's teacher. He adds, moreover, that Devacandra wrote a commentary to Ṭhāna, i. e. the Sthānāṅga, as also a life of Śāntinātha. The latter statements may be correct. For, Devasūri mentions in the Introduction to his *S'āntināthacaritra* that it is translated from the great homonymous Prakrit-poem of Devacandra, the teacher of Hemacandra. Rājaśekhara's account of Devacandra's school and teacher appears, on the other hand, to be partly incorrect. It is true that Jinamaṇḍana says exactly the same that Dattasūri of the Koṭikagaṇa, the Vajra Śākhā and of the Candra Gaccha, had converted the Rāṇā Yaśobhadra, and he gives the same line of teachers: Pradyumnasūri, Guṇasena, Devacadra. But the *Prabhāvakacaritra* (See Note 13, verse 14) calls the latter a pupil of Prandyumnasūri and Hemacandra himself says in the *Mahāvīracarita* that he belonged to the Vajraśākhā and to the line of Municandra.[20] In none of his works, known so far, does Hemacandra give the name of his teacher, although ample opportunity should have been offered for the same. It almost appears as if his later relationship with his teacher might not have been of friendly nature. In this respect, an anecdote given by Merutuṅga could be cited: Devacandra refused to teach his pupil the art of making gold because he had already "ill-digested" other easier sciences and hence was neither worthy nor capable of learning so difficult an art.[21] Whatever be the solution of these difficulties, this much is certain that Devacandra was a learned man who had the qualification to train a pupil like Hemacandra.

In the last years of Somacandra's apprenticeship, the *Prabhāvakacaritra* ascribes a journey, or rather the plan for a journey, by which the young monk wanted to win the favour of the goddess Brāhmī, the patroness of learning, in order to overcome all rivals by her grace. With the permission of his teacher he set out on a tour towards the land of Brāhmī via Tāmaliptī in company of other Sādhus well-versed in the *S'āstras*. He went, however, only upto Raivatāvatāra, the sanctuary of Nemīnātha, where he devoted himself to ascetic practices in Mādhumata Sārtha (?). During the practices, the goddess of speech appeared before him and informed him that he would attain his desire at home. He therefore cancelled his further programme and returned to his teacher.[22] Although in India it be not unusual that a scholar or a poet seeks to attain the *Sārasvata mantra*, a magic formula, which gives him mastery over speech; and although Hemacandra himself admits unreservedly of his faith in such means in his manual of Poetics, the *Alaṁkāracūḍāmaṇi*;[23] yet one must interpret the above story only as an explicative myth. Indeed, the extra-ordinarily naive geographic conceptions of the author point to this. When he says that Somacandra wanted to travel via Tāmaliptī or Tamluk in Bengal in order to reach Brāhmīdeśa, i. e. Kāśmīr, it is clear that he is confounding the Brāhmīdeśa with the Brahmadeśa or Burma. Still more absurd is it that Somacandra is supposed to have gone on his journay first to Raivatāvatāra i. e. Junāgaḍh in Kāṭhiāvāḍ. Later on, Jinamaṇḍana detected this absurdity and tried to make the story more credible by an alteration (See Note 22).

According to all the sources, Somacandra's term of apprenticeship came to a close in Vikrama Saṁvat 1166 as he was then ordained as a Sūri or Ācārya, i. e. an independent exponent of the holy scriptures and a successor of his teacher. On this occasion he again changed his name according to the custom of Jaina-ascetics, and was now called Hemacandra. The *Prabhāvakacaritra* suggests that Devacandra was an old man by this time and soon afterwards took to those chastisements which lead the conscientious Jaina to Nirvāṇa. Except in the above-mentioned story of Merutuṅga, he is no more referred to in the *Prabandhas*. The *Prabhāvakacaritra* adds further that Pāhinī, when her son received the second ordination, took "*cāritra*", that is to say, she entered the Jaina nunnery. According to a further statement of Merutuṅga's, she lived for a considerable time after this and died just about V. S. 1211.

CHAPTER III

Hemacandra and Jayasiṁha-Siddharāja

The sources speak nothing about Hemacandra's life during the time which immediately followed his ordination as a Sūri. They jump over a long series of years and resume only with his migration to Aṇahillapāṭaka or Pattana, the modern Aṇhilvāḍ-Pāṭaṇ, the Capital of Gujarat, where he lived, as the *Prabandhas* expressly and apologetically state, the great part of his life. There, by royal favour, an honourable career as author and promoter of his faith lay open to the Sūri. His first patron was the Caulukya king Jayasiṁha, designated Siddharāja, who had ascended the throne in the year 1150 of the Vikrama era and who ruled over Gujarat and the adjoining provinces of the western India until the Vikrama year 1199. According to all documents, Jayasiṁha was one of the most energetic and ambitious kings of the Caulukya-dynasty. He extended his kingdom as well towards the east as towards the west. Amongst his successful, warlike undertakings, special mention is frequently made in the *Prabandhas,* as well as in inscriptions, of his conquest of Surāṣṭrā or Soraṭh in the south of Kāṭhiāvāḍ and of the occupation of Ujjain, which resulted in the arrest of the king Yas'ovarman and the annexation, at least for the time being, of the western Mālvā. He is equally famous for his public buildings and the construction of huge lakes in Pāṭaṇ, Siddhapur, Kapaḍvanj, Vīramgām and other cities. These lakes are still partly preserved. According to the *Prabandhas,* he was a friend of *belles-lettres* and entertained an earnest desire of seeing his achievements immortalised by a great poet. He therefore patronised the bards and poets and kept a poet laureate, Kavīs'vara S'rīpāla who, though an author of various poetic works, does not seem to have been really able to tackle satisfactorily the task entrusted to him by his patron. The same sources speak also about Jayasiṁha's pursuit of philosophy. Although he was a Śivaite like his forefathers and, according to some stories, rigidly maintained the privileges of the Brahmanical faith, it is however reported that he, being eager to obtain complete deliverance from the fetters of rebirth, summoned from all countries teachers of various sects whom he questioned on Truth and God and the Holy Law, and had them discuss these points in his presence. Hemacandra confirms these statements in the *Pras'asti* to his Grammar (Note 33, verse 18, 22), where he speaks of Jayasiṁha's ascetic propensities, and in the *Dvyās'rayakāvya,* in which mention is made of the establishment of schools where Dialectics, Astronomy and the Purāṇas were taught (see Note 28).

It is easily comprehensible that even a Jaina monk who had a thorough knowledge of Sanskrit-literature and the Brahmanical sciences as well as proficiency in the poetic art, could win the favour of a king of this kind. The sources are not, however, at one as to the art and manner in which Hemacandra came to be introduced to Jayasiṁha. According to the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, by an accidental meeting he became acquainted with the king and by a clever exploitation of the opportunity thus offered, he got entry into the palace. Once, so it is said, Siddharāja passed through the streets of his capital riding on an elephant and saw Hemacandra standing by a shop near a slope. The king stopped his elephant just by the mound (*ṭimbaka*) and called out to the monk: "Recite something!" Hemacandra at once replied with a stanza composed on the spur of the moment: "Siddha, let the stately elephant jump freely without any hesitation! May the world-protecting elephants tremble! What's the good of all of them? By thee alone is the world guarded!" Jayasiṁha was pleased with this stanza so much that he invited the author to go to the palace daily at noon and to entertain him. Hemacandra accepted the invitation and gradually won the king's friendship. Jinamaṇḍana agrees with this story in the main. It appears, however, that he drew his material from some other source. For, the verse which he attributes to Hemacandra, has a different form and he attempts to ascribe the reason of the king's addressing Hemacandra to the astonishing appearance of the latter and to the king's amazement at the same.[24] Merutuṅga mentions nothing of this meeting and its results. According to his report, Hemacandra became known to Jayasiṁha much later, just when he was returning from the victorious expedition against Mālvā. On this occasion Jayasiṁha held, on entering the capital, a ceremonious procession in which Yaśovarman, the captive king of Mālvā, and the rich spoils gathered in the war were triumphantly exhibited. The heads of various fellowships of faiths appeared among the deputations from Aṇhilvāḍ, in accordance with the Indian custom, to shower their benedictions on the victorious king. Among the group of the Jainas was also Hemacandra who had been selected as a spokesman on account of his great learning. He paid homage to the king with these words: "Wish-fulfilling cow, besprinkle the earth with thy fluid! Ye, Oceans, scatter the *svastika*-figures of pearls! Moon, become thou a full bowl! Ye elephants-protectors of quarters of the globe, bring boughs of the heavenly tree, and unplait victory-garlands from them with your long trunks! For, does not the king Siddha, who has conquered the earth, come now?" This stanza that was "adorned with a commentary", was praised by the king and brought its author great honour[25].

The *Prabhāvakacaritra* (see Note 24) and Jinamaṇḍana similarly know this story. They however surmise that Hemacandra only renewed his acquaintance with the king on his return from Mālvā and that he received a new invitation to the palace.

As regards the credibility of these statements, the second of them must certainly be historical. The stanza with which Hemacandra is supposed to have greeted the king, is authentic. For, it is found at the end of the twenty-fourth *Pāda* of Hemacandra's Grammar which, as will be later on shown, contains thirty-five verses composed by the author in honour of the Caulukya kings. The last words, "For, does not the king Siddha, who has conquered the earth, come now?", produce a good sense only if one takes that the *śloka* was composed, as the *Prabandhas* maintain, originally as an occasional poem in honour of a triumphal procession and later inserted into the Grammar. As regards the

story of the meeting in the bazar, it is not possible to be equally certain. In itself the story sounds a bold one. It is not improbable that an Indian prince, who took an interest in the art of poesy, should address a man whose outward appearance struck him, and should, as a reward for a graceful compliment, grant him access to the customary audiences of scholars and poets. It is however hard to comprehend how Jayasiṁha could presuppose a proficiency in poetry in a Jaina-monk who was unknown to him. The matter is made more suspicious by the fact that the stanza, which Hemacandra is supposed to have composed on this occasion, should be given in two different versions and that none of them should exist in the authentic works of Hemacandra. Finally, it is noteworthy that the *Prabhāvakacaritra* should have nothing to report particularly about Hemacandra's intercourse with Jayasiṁha during the period between the first and the second meeting. Only Jinamaṇḍana relates a number of anecdotes regarding this intercourse. Even these anecdotes, according to other sources[26], fall into a later time. Under such circumstances the credibility of the first story is doubtful. Inspite of this, there are some reasons which make it probable that Hemacandra was introduced to the court of Jayasiṁha before the conquest of Mālvā. The expedition against Mālvā, the date of which is not, with exactitude, given in any of the sources, must have taken place after the Vikrama year 1192, as, it is known, in the month of Māgha of that year Prince Yaśovarman who was conquered and taken prisoner by Jayasimha, made a grant of land, which proves that he still occupied the throne.[27] Probably this expedition was undertaken soon after this date. For, Jayasiṁha himself died in the Vikrama year 1199, and it is evident from his biography in Hemacandra's *Dvyāśrayakāvya* that he reigned for many years after his return from Mālvā. Now, if Hemacandra became first acquainted with Jayasiṁha at the time of the latter's imposing triumphal entry, then it could not have happened before the Vikrama Saṁvat 1194; in which case he could have had influence at the court of the king for about five years only. But that this influence lasted much longer than five years is clear from Merutuṅga's account of the famous debate held by the Śvetāmbara Devasūri and the Digambara Kumudcandra in the presence of Jayasiṁha. He describes[29] that, on this occasion the 'young' (किञ्चिद्व्यतिक्रान्तशैशव) Hemacandra was present as a supporter of Devasūri and that he succeeded in winning the favour of the king's mother Mayaṇalladevī for his side. The *Prabhāvakācaritra*, XXI, 195 gives as the exact date of the debate the full-moon day of the month Vaiśākha, Vikrama Saṁvat 1181,[30] while Merutuṅga allows the same to take place towards the end of Jayasiṁha's reign after the expedition against Mālvā. There can be no doubt that the statement of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* deserves preference and that Merutuṅga took the liberty of a fanciful shifting of the date. The last-named fact is especially proved by the remark that Hemacandra was a young man at that time. Had the debate taken place towards the end of the ninetieth year, then Hemacandra should have been over fifty years of age. Under these circumstances, it cannot be denied that, even according to the sources which Merutuṅga used, the first acquaintance of Hemacandra with Jayasiṁha took place before the time of the war with Mālvā. This does not, however, prove that the story of the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, about the first meeting of the both, tells the truth. Its internal improbability remains just as great as before. The story might well have been invented as a historical setting to the famous verses of Hemacandra addressed to the king aftar the real facts leading to the former's introduction into the court of his lord had been forgotten. The facts may be sought in

Jayasiṁha's endeavours to learn the tenets of various sects. Possibly Hemacandra might have also been helped by his connection with Udayana who had great influence. It will also be later on seen that even Udayana's sons stood in very intimate relationship to Hemacandra. This help was quite natural and to be expected because Udayana had taken the boy Cāṅgadeva under his care. Hemacandra's former acquaintance with Jayasiṁha was probably not very intimate, for, the oldest source, as we have already noted, has nothing to say about it, while the stories of Jinamaṇḍana deserve no credence.

On the other hand, by reason of his benedictions at the king's procession, Hemacandra appears to have won a lasting influence. He became, first of all, Court-Pandit and then Court-Annalist. In the first position, he was entrusted by Jayasiṁha with the preparation of a new grammar. In the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, further circumstances which induced the king to take this step, have been described as follows. Sometime after his triumphal entrance into the city, the manuscripts captured in Ujjain were exhibited to Jayasiṁha himself and the scholars of his court. He was attracted by one treatise on grammar that was among them. He questioned what that work was and in reply he was told that it was a work on etymology, compiled by the Paramāra king Bhoja; and the extensive literary activity of that poly-historian who had written works on all branches of learning, was highly praised. The praise kindled Jayasiṁha's jealousy and he expressed his regret that his treasury had no such series of manuals written in his kingdom. Thereupon all the scholars assembled there turned their faces towards Hemacandra, suggesting thereby that they considered him worthy of becoming the Bhoja of Gujarat. The king espoused their opinion and requested Hemacandra to prepare a new grammar, as the then available grammars, being too short or too difficult and antiquated, did not serve their purpose. Hemacandra expressed his willingness to accede to his lord's wish; he begged however for his help in securing the necessary materials, such as the eight older grammars which were to be found in their entirety only in the library of the Temple of Sarasvatī in Kaśhmīr. Jayasiṁha at once sent high officials to Pravarapura to fetch the MSS. The officials put up in the temple of the deity and laid their petition. Pleased with their songs of praise, there appeared Sarasvatī to them and ordered the librarian to send the desired works to her favourite Hemacandra. Her command was carried out and the scholar Utsāha returned to Aṇhilvāḍ with the books. The ambassadors, on their return, described to the king how highly his *protégé* stood in favour of the goddess. The king considered his land fortunate in having such a man. Hemacandra looked through the MSS. brought to him and compiled his grammar in eight Adhyāyas and thirty-two Pādas; and in homage to the king he entitled it *Siddhahemacandra*, "compiled by Hemacandra and dedicated to Siddharāja". As the custom required, the work consisted of five parts, the Aphorisms, the Indexes of the Words formed with *uṇādi* suffixes, a Root-lexicon, a Treatise on the Rules of Gender, and a Running Commentary. Hemacandra furthermore added two more lexica, the *Nāmamālā* and the *Anekārthakoṣa*. In order to characterise the Grammar as a court-work, the author adorned it with a *praśasti*, a poem of praise, in 35 stanzas in honour of the Caulukya dynasty from Mūlarāja down to Jayasiṁha. One stanza at the end of every *pāda* and four stanzas at the end of the whole work were given. On its completion, the grammar was read before the court and was accepted by the scholars as a model work because of its clarity and precision. The king then summoned

three hundred copyists to Aṇhilvāḍ, who had to make copies during three years. Then he presented one copy to each of the heads of all the sects in his kingdom and dispatched other copies all over India, nay, even beyond the borders of India, into Persia, Ceylon and Nepal. Twenty copies were also sent to Kāśmīr which the goddess Sarasvatī accepted for the library of her Temple. In order to further still more the study of this work, Kāyastha Kākala, a well-known grammarian, was invited to teach it in Aṇhilvāḍ. Every month a public examination of his pupils was held on the Jñānapañcamī. Whoever did his task well, received from the king a shawl, a golden ornament, a sedan-chair or a sunshade.

Merutuṅga's account which Jinamaṇḍana copies almost *verbatim* is much shorter and runs quite differently. When the king praised Hemacandra's stanza composed in honour of his triumphal entrance, it is said in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*,[32] some jealous Brahmins remarked: "The monk has drawn his wisdom purely from our books!" The king thereupon asked Hemacandra if it was so. The latter replied: "We study the Jaina-grammar which Mahāvīra in his childhood explained to Indra". The envious Brahmins rejoined that it was a story of hoary antiquity; and that Hemacandra might name a more modern grammarian of his faith. Then the monk offered himself to write a new grammar *in a few days* if only His Highness Siddharāja helped him. The king consented and dismissed the scholars. After the celebrations of the triumphal entrance were over, the king was reminded of the story of the grammar and he ordered to collect, as promised, MSS. of all the existing grammars from many lands and also summoned scholars who were conversant with various systems. Hemacandra then wrote *in one year* the *Siddhahemacandra* in five parts which contained 125,000 couplets, each of 32 syllables. When the book was ready, it was brought to the palace in right royal honour on the state-elephant and was deposited there in the treasury. From that time onwards, all other grammars were ignored and the *Siddhahemacandra* alone was studied everywhere. This disappointed the rivals of Hemacandra and one of them secretly sneaked to the king that the grammar did not contain, as it should have contained, a poem of praise in honour of the Caulukya dynasty. Hemacandra got scent of that scandal and learned that the king was angry with him for that oversight. Thereupon he composed at once thirty-two stanzas in honour of the Caulukyas and recited them the next morning when his grammar was being read in the palace. The king was thereby reconciled and ordered that the knowledge of the Grammar be further spread.

It can be seen at the first glance that neither of the two stories possesses a claim to credibility in all its details. As Hemacandra's grammar is, however, preserved in its completeness and as recently many later works bearing on the same have become known, it is possible to examine critically the statements of tradition and to note that a great part of them, especially of those in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, is quite correct. To this category belong, first of all, the date of the last-named work as to the extent, the arrangement and character of the Grammar, as well as the cause that led to its compilation. The *Siddhahemacandra* contains, it is true, eight *Adhyāyas* and thirty-two *Pādas* and at the end of the commentary on each *Pāda* comes one stanza in honour of one of the first seven Caulukya kings while at the end of the whole there are four stanzas.[33] The *Siddha-*

hemacandra is said to be a work in five parts also in MSS. and there are, besides the Sūtras, still separate sections about the *uṇādi*-suffixes, the *gaṇas*, the roots and the gender of nouns. Besides this, the author has provided all the parts of his book with a commentary in two recensions,[34] whose compilation falls, as some allusions to the victory of Jayasiṁha, and the *Pras'astis* show, in the time of the reign of Siddharāja. Moreover, it is not only dedicated, as the title indicates, to the king Jayasiṁha-Siddharāja, but it also owes its origin to the request or command of the king. Quite similarly to the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, it is said in the *Pras'asti*, stanza 35, that Siddharāja being dissatisfied with the older grammars, requested the monk Hemacandra to write a new one and that the monk thereupon wrote it "according to the rules". Of the further statement of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* that the inspection of the MSS., secured in Mālvā, was the immediate cause of the king's command, there is in fact no corroboration in other works. And yet this statement, considered on its own merits, is by no means improbable. For, when Jayasiṁha cherished the anxious desire, as already mentioned, to immortalise the memory of his reign through literary works, it was then only natural that the perusal of Bhoja's works aroused his jealousy and induced him to call upon the best scholar in his empire to write similar works. The *Siddhahemacandra* is then a compilation from earlier grammars as opined by the tradition. It is based specially on the grammar of Śākaṭāyana and on the *Kātantra*, as Kielhorn has shown. In his commentary on the work, Hemacandra cites very often the views of "others", of "certain persons", et cetera; and with the help of glossaries-unfortunately incomplete ones-to the Commentary, Kielhorn has discovered that for the first five *Pādas*, not less then 15 different grammatical works had been used.[35] For the whole work, the number is no doubt appreciably greater. From this, it appears quite credible that Hemacandra had collected materials from various places before he began his work, as also that his patron had been helpful in his task. Even at present the Indian princes provide their court-pandits almost regularly with MSS. and often manage to get them from afar at great cost. When, however, the *Prabhāvakacaritra* opines on this point that all the MSS. came from the library of the temple of Sarasvatī in Kāśmīr, it must be an exaggeration, originating in the author's too high a regard for the literary greatness of the land of Śāradā. Merutuṅga's statement that the king managed to gather grammars from various lands, is more probable. Finally, one cannot declare as untrustworthy the statement made in both the sources that Jayasiṁha accelerated the circulation of the new *Vyākaraṇa*, distributed the copies of the same and appointed a teacher in order to teach it to others. If the pains taken by the king Ānandapāla with a view to circulating the *S'iṣyahitā* written by his teacher Ugrabhūti, as described by Berūnī, are without doubt historical,[36] then similar statements about the works written at the command of the princes deserve full consideration. In the case of the *Siddhahemacandra*, it is to be further added that the grammarian Kākala—as the exponent of this grammar is called in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*-is not only a historical personality, but really did make himself useful in expounding the work. One opinion of Kakkala is mentioned in the *Nyāsa* on the commentary of Hemacandra, used by Kielhorn. Moreover, Guṇacandra, a pupil of Devasūri, praises a great dialectician, poet and grammarian, by name Kakkalla who was a sort of a professor, and says that it was at the command of Kakkalla that he wrote the *Tattvaprakās'ikā* or *Haimavibhrama*-an essay to interpret the *Siddhahemacandra*.[37] *Kākala*, *Kakkala* and *Kakkalla* are the three Prakrit-forms produced partly through

difference of accentuation, and all of them are diminutives of the Sanskrit name *Karka*. They designate without doubt one and the same personality. Devasūri, the spiritual teacher of Guṇacandra is probably the famous Jaina-bishop, already mentioned, who in V. S. 1181 held a debate with Kumudacandra and died in V. S. 1226. If one agrees to this, then the statements of Guṇacandra seem to confirm those in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*. On another point, namely, the mention of the period at which Hemacandra completed his work, the statements of the *Prabandhas* are to be rectified. The *Prabhāvakacaritra* does not, it is true, say anything in detail about this but suggests that the Grammar was composed within a short space of time. Merutuṅga, on the other hand, opines boldly that it was written in one single year. This is simply an impossibility and, moreover, is contradicted by a remark in stanza 23 of the *Pras'asti*. There Hemacandra mentions that Jayasiṁha has celebrated a festival of pilgrimage (यात्रानंद: कृत: ।). The *Dvyās'rayakāvya* speaks only of a single pilgrimage of the king to Devapattana and Girnār, which seems to have taken place in the last year of his rule (See Note 28). The *Pras'asti* must, therefore, have been written after this pilgrimage and, as it must only have been written after the completion of the Grammar, the latter (the Grammar) also should have been finished after this time. Between the return from Mālvā and the end of the pilgrimage, two or three years might have passed according to the statements of the *Dvyās'raya*. As the former falls, according to the above arguments, in the Vikrama year 1194, then the Grammar must have been ready, at the earliest, towards the end of the Vikrama-year 1197.

The success of his Grammar appears to have induced Hemacandra to extend further the scope of his work and to write a number of handbooks which should give the students of Sanskrit composition-and more particularly of the poetics-complete guidance to correct and eloquent expression. This endeavour led to the compilation of a number of Sanskrit-lexica and textbooks of rhetoric and matrics, as well as of a formal artistic poem meant for illustrating the grammatical rules. This poem is *Dvyās'rayamahākāvya* which contains the history of the Caulukya princes. The series of these works opened with a homonymic lexicon, the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* or *Nāmamāla*, by name. Then followed the synonymic lexicon, the *Anekārthasaṁgraha*; thereafter the manual of poetics, the *Alaṁkāracūḍāmaṇi*; and lastly the *Chandonus'āsana*, the Metrics. This order is chiefly fixed by the statements given in the above-named works.[38] With reference to the first two, the *Prabhāvakacaritra* (Note 31, verse 98) says that they were completed simultaneously with the Grammar. There is little possibility in this, as the composition of the Grammar, its appendices and commentaries would have been quite sufficient work for that short period, even if Hemacandra, as is very usual in India, took the help of his pupils while compiling the commentaries and even if he had made preparations for his work earlier. The Grammar does not, it is true, contain 125,000 *s'lokas*, as Merutuṅga would have us believe. But including the commentaries and the appendices which, in their turn, have commentaries, it has something like 20,000 to 30,000 *s'lokas*. It might, however, be right that both of the *Koṣas* were completed before Jayasiṁha's death. That none of them contains a dedication or other usual characteristic to prove that the work was written at the king's command, is no obstacle here. Hemacandra seems to have

regarded them, as is also suggested by their not being mentioned in the *Alaṁkāracūḍāmaṇi* (see Note 38), as supplements to the Grammar, and on this account he might have considered any mention of his patron as superfluous. According to a short note[39] which Merutuṅga gives at the end of the story of the Grammar, the *Dvyās'rayamahākāvya* also belongs to this period. It is said to have been written immediately after the Grammar, in order to celebrate Siddharāja's conquest of the world. This cannot, however, be absolutely correct. For, the last five cantos of the poem, *Sargas* XVI–XX, describe a great part of the career of the king Kumārapāla who was Jayasiṁha's successor. The end indicates that Kumārapāla was still living and stood at the zenith of his power. In its form, as extant, it cannot have been completed before V. S. 1220. Now because Hemacandra had also undertaken to revise one other work towards the end of his life, as will be later on shown, it is quite possible that the *Dvyās'rayakāvya* was undertaken at the wish of Jayasiṁha and perhaps was finished upto the narration of the deeds of the king, that is, upto the fourteenth *Sarga.* In support of this, one can also add that the author of the *Ratnamālā* says,[40] Jayasiṁha had the annals of his dynasty prepared under his order, and that nothing is known about any other comprehensive chronicle of the Caulukyas excepting Hemacandra's work. While there is still some probability of the two *koṣas* and the *Kāvya* having been written wholly or partly during the period of Jayasiṁha's reign, the same is not the case about the *Alaṁkāracūḍāmaṇi* and the *Chandonus'āsana.* These were probably written in the beginning of the rule of Kumārapāla. The reasons for this hypothesis are given below.

Many more anecdotes are described in the *Prabandhas* about Jayasiṁha's intercourse with Hemacandra after the compilation of the Grammar. The greater number of them deserves no serious attention because of their very character and those few which, at first, appear as if they were historical, prove to be, on closer scrutiny, of doubtful worth. The first story which the *Prabhāvakacaritra* describes, tells us that Rāmacandra, a prominent pupil of Hemacandra's, lost his right eye, because Jayasiṁha–to whom he had been introduced by his teacher–exhorted him to have only *one eye* on the Jaina doctrine (*ekadṛṣṭir bhava*). Merutuṅga, on the other hand, has another explanation for the probably historical fact that Rāmacandra was a one-eyed man. According to his statement, this defect was the result of an ill-considered stricture which Rāmacandra, despite the warning of his teacher, passed on Śrīpāla's praise-poem on the Sahasraliṅga lake.[41] The second story of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* describes how cleverly Hemacandra contrived to help himself out of adverse situations, and to silence the envious Brahmins. Once, so runs the story, a Brahmin who had listened to the exposition of Nemicarita in the Caturmukha temple of the Jainas, complained to Jayasiṁha that the heretics themselves did not even respect the venerable traditions of the *Mahābhārata*, and that they asserted the conversion of the Pāṇḍavas to Jainism. He added the request thereto that the king might check such a travesty of truth. However, before pronouncing any opinion on the matter, Jayasiṁha wanted to hear what the other party had to say and sent for Hemacandra as he was, in Jayasiṁha's opinion, the most learned and truth-loving Jaina. On being questioned whether the complaints of the Brahmin had in them any truth or not, Hemacandra admitted that the sacred scriptures of the Jainas did contain

the said dactrine. But he advanced an excuse for the same by saying that it referred to a verse in the Mahābhārata where mention was made of hundred Bhīṣmas, three hundred Pāṇḍavas, thousand Droṇas and numberless Karṇas. Then he added that it might be quite possible that some of these many Pāṇḍavas were converted to the Jaina faith. Moreover, their statues could be seen in Śatruñjaya, Nasik and Kedāra. As the Brahmin did not know how to reply to such an argument, the king refused to take any proceedings against the Jainas.[42]

The three other *Prabandhas* make no mention of this story. The same, however, appears in another version in the *Kathākoṣa*. On the other hand, we find in Merutuṅga, in a somewhat divergent form, a repetition of the third story of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* about the snubbing of the Purohita Āmiga by Hemacandra. Āmiga censured that the Jaina ascetics received women into their monasteries and that they enjoyed too good meals. Such practices, he thought, easily led to violations of the vow of chastity. Thereupon Hemacandra silenced him with a simile that the moderation of the flesh-eating lion stands opposite to the erotic tendencies of the dove that lives on only feeble grains, and that proves the insignificance of the type of diet. Merutuṅga maintains that the incident took place during Kumārapāla's reign[43] and it is probable that Āmiga served the latter. The fourth story in the *Prabhāvakacaritra* deals with the Bhāgavata-ascetic Devabodha who played a great rolé for some time in Aṇhilvāḍ and who behaved very arrogantly towards the king and the court-poet Śrīpāla, despite the fact that he was generously patronised by the king. Later on, he was suspected of holding drinking-bouts against the rules of his order. Although he managed to prevent any proof being found of his guilt, he was thenceforward neglected and driven to poverty. At last, he went to Hemacandra and composed a verse in his honour. Hemacandra had pity on him and obtained a lac for him from the king. With that money he paid his debts. Then he went to the bank of the Gaṅgā and awaited his deliverance. This anecdote, too, is mentioned nowhere else. On the contrary, Devabodha is mentioned as an opponent of Hemacandra in Jinamaṇḍana's account of Kumārapāla's conversion, and it appears as if Rājaśekhara (see Note 5) alluded to the latter story.[44]

The fifth and last story of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* deals with Hemacandra's experiences of the pilgrimage which has been already referred to and which Jayasiṁha made towards the end of his reign to Somanātha or Devapattana, the present-day Verāval in Soraṭh. Jayasiṁha was, so it is said, greatly purturbed because of his having no issue at all. He undertook therefore a pilgrimage on which Hemacandra accompanied him. First of all, they visited Śatruñjaya where Jayasiṁba paid his homage to the first Tīrthaṁkara and presented twelve villages to the shrine. From Śatruñjaya he proceeded towards Saṁkalī near Girnār and viewed therefrom the temple of Neminātha, which his officer Sajjana had ordered to be built out of the revenues of the province Saurāṣṭra, without being authorised to do so. In order to secure the merit of having built the Temple for himself, Jayasiṁha freed the Governor from the repayment of the sum used, amounting to 27 lacs. Then he climbed the mountain Girnār and worshipped the Jina. Then he proceeded with Hemacandra to Someśvarapattana and paid homage to Śiva

whom Hemacandra also praised as the Paramātman. The last station on the journey was Koṭinagara, the modern Koḍināra in Soraṭh, where the temple of Ambikā existed. Jayasiṁha prayed to the Goddess that she might grant him a son. Hemacandra joined his prayers to those of the king and fasted for three days. Then there appeared Ambikā to him and informed him that Jayasiṁha would get no progeny but would have to leave his kingdom to Kumārapāla.[45]

The same story is found with some omissions and additions in Jinamaṇḍana. The visit of Girnār is omitted therein as well as the anecdote of Sajjana's temple and Hemacandra's worship of Śiva. On the other hand, it is said, Jayasiṁha went, after his visit to Koṭinagara–or Koṭināri according to the Prakrit from–once again to Somanāthapattana in order to make his request to Śiva. The god appeared in person to the king, and refused to grant him a son.[46] Wholly different is the story, in Merutuṅga. He is well acquainted with the pilgrimage of Jayasiṁha. He, however, knows nothing about Hemacandra's taking part in it, and he therefore assumes that Hemacandra composed the verse to Śiva which is quoted in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, while on a visit to Somanāthapattana, which visit he made much later in company with Kumārapāla. According to him the route of the march was, also, quite different. The king visited first of all Somanāthapattana. On his return, he encamped at the foot of Girnār; he did not however climb on the mountain, for the envious Brahmins declared to him that the mountain looked like a Liṅga standing in a water-tank and therefore must not be trodden by foot. From Girnār, so it is said by Merutuṅga, Jayasiṁha wended his way to Śatruñjaya and visited the temples there, despite the opposition of his Brahmin advisers, by night and in disguise. Merutuṅga also mentions the grant of twelve villages. In the same way he knows the story of Sajjana; but he does not bring it in connection with the pilgrimage.[47] Nor does he mention the visit to Koṭinagara. Now, if one compares what Hemacandra himself has written about Jayasiṁha's pilgrimage in the *Dvyāś'raya*, one sees that the description of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* is decidedly false, while Merutuṅga's account thereof also contains errors. The *Dvyāś'raya* differs from the *Prabhāvakacaritra* in that it is silent on Hemacandra's participation in the pilgrimage, in that the route of the march is defferent, although it is the same as given by Merutuṅga, and in that there is no reference to a visit to Koṭinagara and to the revelation of Ambikā. On the contrary, it is assumed that Śiva revealed himself to Jayasiṁha in Somanāthapattana and informed him of Kumārapāla's destiny. Going against Merutuṅga's statement, the *Dvyāś'raya* affirms that Jayasiṁha climbed the hill Girnār and there worshipped the Neminātha. Lastly, he contradicts both the *Prabhāvakacaritra* and Merutuṅga by reporting that from Girnār Jayasimha did not go to Śatruñjaya but took the direct route to Siṁhapur or Sīhor, and by saying nothing about the alleged grant of land to the shrine of the first Jina. As Hemacandra quite carefully takes note in the *Dvyāś'raya* of all other favours granted to his own faith, his silence in this case is very significant.[48]

To these stories from the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, Merutuṅga adds three others, one of which is mentioned also by Jinamaṇḍana. The first two of these are intended to show Hemacandra's erudition. It is said that he alone could explain a Sanskrit verse

sent by the king of Ḍāhala and that it was he who, on another occasion, had at once composed the second half of a Prakrit-Dodhaka, the first half of which had been sent for Jayasiṁha's poets as *samasyā* by the king of Sapādalakṣa. The Sanskrit-verse is the well-known riddle with the word *hāra*. It belongs to the favourite passages with which the Pandits amuse themselves in their *sabhās* and it is so easy that great scholarship is not needed for its solution.[49]

The third story has quite a different character. Once, says Merutuṅga, Siddharāja who was seeking the right path to deliverance, ordered an inquiry into the teachings of all sects of all nations. The result was unsatisfactory. Every teacher praised his own faith and censured all the other systems. The king was, therefore, as if seated on a "swing of doubt" and turned finally to Hemacandra in order to know what the proper attitude should be in such circumstances. Hemacandra gave him his advice in the form of a parable, common in the Purāṇas. He said, there lived a merchant, ages ago, who neglected his own wife and gave away all his property to a courtesan. His wife tried zealously to win back the love of her husband and inquired after all means of magic with which to accomplish her end. Thereupon a Gauḍa promised her "to get her husband tied down to her with a bridle" and gave her some medicine with instructions to mix the same in the food. After some days, when the woman put this advice into practice, her husband was turned into a bull. Thereupon the whole world rebuked her, and she fell into deep despondency for she did not know how to undo the effect of her unholy action. Once she took her metamorphosed husband to the pasture for grazing. She sat in the shade of a tree, loudly weeping over her fate. In the meanwhile, she heard a conversation which was being carried on between Śiva and his wife Pārvatī in a *vimāna*, flying above in the air. Pārvatī asked about the cause of the sorrows of the shepherdess and Śiva told her all about it. He also added that a healing herb grew in the shade of that very tree, which was capable of metamorphosing the bull back into his own original form. As the kind of the creeper was not specifically designated, the woman gathered up all that grew under the shade of the tree and threw it before the bull. He ate it, and became a man again. Now, just as the unknown creeper, thus concluded Hemacandra, proved itself to be of a healing virtue, even so also a believing reverence for all religions leads one to salvation, even though one may not know which of them really deserves reverence. From that time the king respected all sects.[50] Jinamaṇḍana[51] gives another independent version of the story which is also much better in style. The same author also connects two more little anecdotes with this one. The one speaks of a second conversation over the same question, during which Hemacandra recommended to the king the so-called "common duties" such as generosity to worthy men, becoming behaviour towards venerable persons, kind-heartedness towards all beings etc., and declared in the words of the Mahābhārata that those who were devoutly pious in their conduct and not those inclined to self-castigation, nor yet the learned, were of real worth. According to the other anecdote, Hemacandra enlightened the king when the latter had a temple of Śiva and another of Mahāvīra built in Siddhapura, that the latter divinity was even greater than the former. For, though Śiva bears the moon on his forehead, all the nine planets may be seen at Mahāvīra's feet. Those who were well-versed in architecture corroborated

this statement and found that the temples of the Jinas were preferable to those of the Brahmanic gods in other respects also, according to the rules in their scriptures. Thereupon, thus it is concluded, Siddharāja discarded from himself the darkness of doubt.[51]

In view of the fact that some of the stories quoted appear to be mythical at the first sight, and that regarding most of the remaining, the *Prabandhas* contradict each other, it would be more than presumptuous to assume any of them as really historical. On the contrary, it is not at all improbable that they describe rightly on the whole the mode and manner in which Hemacandra behaved himself towards the king. Hemacandra would naturally have access to the audience of his lord during the last years of his life. He would have doubtless striven to shine out by his scholarship and smartness and he would have let no opportunity pass unexploited for a good word in favour of his own sect or at least for the equality of rights of the non-Brahmanic sects. In so doing, he would not miss to particularly stress those points in which the Jaina-doctrine coincided with the Brahmanic faith. It will be shown later on that like a clever missionary he did not fail also in his works to make use of such points of coincidence, and when it suited his purpose, he invoked the authority of the most popular Brahmanic scriptures in his favour. Lastly, he certainly had ample opportunity of defending himself and his co-religionists against the attacks of envious Brahmins and the statement that he employed such devices, as the one mentioned in connection with the defence of Nemicarita, is not incredible. Such traits are characteristically Indian and they are found very often amongst the Jainas. As yet one cannot with absolute certainty measure how great was the influence which Hemacandra exercised over Jayasiṁha to the advantage of his own sect. One might give credence, to a certain extent, to Hemacandra's own statement in the *Dvyās'raya*, according to which Jayasiṁha built a temple of Māhavīra in Siddhapura and paid his homage to Neminātha on the mountain Girnār. For, there are enough examples, in old and recent times, of Indian Princes, who were not bigoted but rather liberal in their religious views, offering many presents to deities of faiths other than their own; indeed they have even worshipped them specially when they had to wait, like Jayasiṁha, vainly for the fulfilment of some long-cherished desire. But it is another question whether Jayasiṁha's propensity towards Jainism or favouritism towards the same, is to be ascribed exclusively to the efforts of Hemacandra. The most recent researches make it highly improbable that this was the case, for, they show that other Jaina-monks also had access to Jayasiṁha's court and were allowed to expound their doctrines to him. Amongst them, there is mention of a second Hemacandra, also named Maladhārin, who appears, judging from the dates of his works, to have been ten to twenty years older than Hemacandra, the compiler of the Grammar. A work belonging probably to the 13th century, says: "Jayasiṁha drank the nectar of his speech". In a *Pras'asti* composed in about 1400 A. D., it is even said that he converted Jayasiṁha and induced him to adorn the Jaina temples in his own kingdom and foreign parts with golden flag-staves and knobs and also to issue an edict which prohibited the killing of animals on 80 days in each year. If one might put one's trust in these latter statements, then the achievements of the grammarian Hemacandra should be very doubtful. Unfortunately

however, the author of the *Pras'asti* mentioned, the same Rājaśekhara who wrote the *Prabandhakoṣa,* is so far removed from the events described that one can hardly believe him unconditionally. Besides this older Hemacandra, a Yati named Samudraghoṣa is said to have "entertained the Siddhapati in the capital of Gūrjara".[54] At any rate, these statements are sufficient to prove that the grammarian Hemacandra was not the only Jaina-favourite of Jayasiṁha, as has been supposed by the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, Merutuṅga and Jinamaṇḍana. He is their hero and they are dazzled by the brilliance of his position at the court of Kumārapāla. These circumstances have naturally influenced their representation of his relationship with Jayasiṁha.

CHAPTER IV

The Accounts regarding the First Acquaintance of Kumārapāla and Hemacandra

However much the opinions may differ as to Hemacandra's success as a missionary at Jayasimha's court, it is certain that it was his religious zeal and eloquence that was responsible for the conversion of the next Caulukya king. Jayasimha died in the Vikrama-year 1199, his desire of getting a son remaining unfulfilled. After a short inter-regnum, his grandnephew Kumārapāla ascended the throne of Gujarat, being helped by his brother-in-law, General Kṛṣṇa or Kāṇhaḍa by name, and being elected by the prominent persons of the empire. Kumārapāla's great-grandfather was Kṣemarāja, the eldest son of Bhīma I, who, according to one report, had renounced the throne willingly. But according to another report, he was overlooked in succession to the throne because his mother, named Cakulādevī, was a courtesan whom Bhīma had received in his harem. Kṣemarāja's son Devaprasāda had been an intimate friend of king Karṇa, Bhīma's son, and had received from the latter the village Dadhisthalī, the present-day Dethlī, not far from Aṇhilvāḍ, as a royal grant. At Karṇa's death, he burnt himself after having entrusted Jayasimha to his son Tribhuvanapāla. Tribhuvanapāla remained true to the lord of his family, just like his father. In battle, he used to stand before the king so as to protect him with his own body. He must have died long before the end of Jayasimha's rule, as he is not mentioned in the accounts of the last years of this king. As Jayasimha remained childless down to his old age, Kumārapāla naturally stepped into the foreground as the presumptive heir to the throne. In order to convince Jayasimha that his grand-nephew would ascend the throne of Aṇhilvāḍ after his death, no revelations of Mahādeva or Ambikā, and no prophecies of the court-astrologers, about which the *Dvyāśraya* and the *Prabandhas* speak, were needed. But this idea was not at all agreeable to Jayasimha. He bitterly hated Kumārapāla and attempted to kill him. According to Merutuṅga's statement, the reason for his repugnance was Kumārapāla's descent from the courtesan Cakulādevī. According to Jinamaṇḍana's account, he hoped that, if Kumārapāla were cleared out of the way, Śiva might even yet grant him a son.

When Kumārapāla learned of the king's intentions, he fled from Dethlī, and led for several years a wanderer's unsteady life, disguised as a Śivaite ascetic. first he seems to have continued staying in Gujarat. Later on, Jayasiṁha's persecutions, which increased in seriousness day by day, forced him to leave his motherland.[55] The *Prabandhas* relate a number of romantic adventures which are supposed to have taken place at Kumārapāla's flight and during his erratic wandering in Gujarat and in foreign lands, they take great pains in representing Hemacandra as the protector of the persecuted prince and as the prophet of his future greatness. The *Prabhāvakacaritra* contains the following statements about Hemacandra's part in Kumārapāla's destiny. Jayasiṁha, so it is said, came to know through his spies that Kumārapāla was found to be amongst a crowd of three hundred ascetics who had come to Aṇhilvāḍ. In order to get hold of him, the king invited all of them to a feast. He himself washed the feet of each of them, apparently to show them his reverence, but really in order to find out who amongst them had the signs of royal dignity on the soles of his feet. As soon as he touched Kumārapāla's feet, he found the lines forming a lotus, a flag and a sunshade. He made a signal to his servants with his eyes. Kumārapāla saw the signal and fled most quickly into the dwelling place of Hemacandra, the spies following him. Hemacandra covered him quickly with a heap of palm-leaves under which the officials, hastily passing by, forgot to search for him. When the immediate danger was over, Kumārapāla absconded from Aṇhilvāḍ and reached, after many adventures in the company of another Śivaite Brahmin Bosari, the neighbourhood of Stambhatīrtha or Cambay. Having arrived there, he sent his companion into the city to Śrīmālī Vāṇiā Udayana–the same man who had befriended Hemacandra's father, according to the above-mentioned story–and asked him for help. Udayana hesitated to have dealings with an enemy of the king. Thereupon, Kumārapāla, feeling very hungry, went himself to the city by night and came to a Jaina-monastery where Hemacandra had taken up his residence during the rainy season. Hemacandra received him cordially, for he at once recognised him from his auspicious signs that this was the future king. He prophesied to him that he would ascend the throne in the seventeenth year and induced Udayana to give him food and money. Then Kumārapāla wandered further and passed here and there in foreign lands for seven years as a Kāpālika, in company of his wife, Bhopāladevī. In 1199 Jayasiṁha died. When Kumārapāla received this news, he returned to Aṇhilvāḍ with a view to securing the throne for himself. On his arrival there, he met one Śrīmat-Sāmba (?), an otherwise unknown personality. Śrīmat-Sāmba took him to Hemacandra in order to find out an auspicious sign, for he had still doubts as to his attaining the aim. On his entrance, Kumārapāla happened to sit down on the cushioned throne-seat of the monastery and supplied thereby, according to Hemacandra, the longed-for sign. The following day, the prince went with his brother-in-law Kṛṣṇadeva, a Sāmanta, who had command over 10,000 soldiers, into the palace and was elected the king.[56]

Merutuṅga's account of Kumārapāla's flight and wanderings, agrees on the whole with that of the *Prabhāvakacaritra*. As regards the divergences in details, it is to be noted that Hemacandra appears only once in Merutuṅga's story. Merutuṅga says nothing about Kumārapāla's being hidden in Aṇhilvāḍ under the palm-leaves by Hemacandra; nor does he mention the second prophecy immediately before the election

to the throne. He relates only the story of the meeting in Stambhatīrtha, with a few small variations. After Kumārapāla had wandered over various countries on his flight from Aṇhilvāḍ, he turned towards Cambay with a view to begging Udayana for money for his travels. As Udayana was at the Jaina monastery when Kumārapāla arrived, the latter also went there. There he met Hemacandra who at once prophesied to him that he would become a king ruling over the whole earth. As Kumārapāla would not believe that, Hemacandra wrote his prophecy down and gave one copy to Udayana, the king's councillor, and another to the prince. Thereupon the latter said: "If it will come true, then thou shalt be the real king; I shall only be dust at thy feet". Hemacandra replied that the kingship was of no consequence to him but that Kumārapāla should not forget his word and should later on be thankful to the Jaina Dharma and faithful to it. Thereupon Kumārapāla was supplied with food and drink at Udayana's own house and was also given the desired money for the journey. Then he turned towards Mālvā where he remained till Jayasiṁha's death. When the latter died, he returned to Aṇhilvād and carried his election to the throne into effect with the help of his brother-in-law Kāhnaḍadeva 'who led him into the palace with his troops ready for war'.[57]

Jinamaṇḍana brings Kumārapāla and Hemacandra together much earlier. He describes, Kumārapāla had gone to the court to pay his homage, before the king persecuted him. There he saw Hemacandra sitting before the king and went soon afterwards to the monastery in order to meet the monk. There Hemacandra delivered him a sermon and finally made him take a vow "of viewing others' wives thenceforth as sisters".[58] Jinamaṇḍana's version of the story of Kumārapāla's flight is, as far as Hemacandra's part is concerned, a mixture of the stories of both the *Prabhāvakacaritra* and the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*. According to his presentation Hemacandra meets–as Merutuṅga says–the fugitive first in Cambay. But the meeting takes place accidentally in a temple outside the gates of Cambay whereto Udayana also comes with a view to paying his homage to Hemacandra. The presence of Udayana is made use of in introducing his whole previous history which Hemacandra relates on being questioned by Kumārapāla as to who the visitor was. Then follows Hemacandra's prophecy and Kumārapāla's hospitable reception at Udayana's house, exactly as in Merutuṅga. On the contrary, it is said that Kumārapāla remained for a long time at his host's. Jayasiṁha received the news of his sojourn in Cambay and sent soldiers to capture him. Pursued by the latter he fled into Hemacandra's monastery and hid himself there under a heap of manuscripts in the cellar. The last episode is possibly a recast of the story of the first assistance of Devacandra which the *Prabhāvakacaritra* relates. Jinamaṇḍana appears to have felt that it was absurd to let Hemacandra appear on the scene first at Aṇhilvāḍ and shortly afterwards at Cambay. Therefore he has probably changed the story of Kumārapāla's rescue under the palm-leaves at the latter place and has added, with a view to making it seem more probable, that the manuscripts lay in the cellar, as is always the case. Jinamaṇḍana's further description of Kumārapāla's wandering is much more detailed than in both the other works, and must have had its origin in some other sources. He makes the Prince first turn towards Vaṭapadra–Baroda, then towards Bhṛgukaccha–Broach, thence Kolhāpur, Kalyāṇa, Kāñcī and other cities of Deccan and reach finally Mālvā via Pratiṣṭhāna–Paiṭhan. A great part of this section is in verses and appears to be plagiarized from one of the many materials of *Kumārapālacaritas*.[59]

CHAPTER V

The Stories Regarding Kumārapāla's Conversion

After these stories which represent Hemacandra as a saviour of the absconding prince and as the prophet of his future greatness, one would expect that soon after Kumārapāla's accession to the throne, there would be a mention of a close friendship between the two. That is, however, not the case. According to both of the oldest works, the intimate intercourse of the monk with the king began much later and that, too, not on account of the earlier beneficence of the monk, but owing to entirely different circumstances. After Kumārapāla had been crowned, so it is said in the *Prabhāvakacaritra,* he decided to suppress Arṇorāja, the arrogant king of Sapādalakṣa i. e. Eastern Rājputānā, and accordingly prepared for the war. With all his barons and their troops he proceeded. After some days he reached the fortress Ajameru, the modern Ajmer. He besieged it but could not conquer it despite all endeavours. When the monsoons set in, he returned to Aṇhilvāḍ without having carried his purpose into effect. At the beginning of the cold season he again set forth, but had, however, to return again at the end of the summer, without having achieved the fall of Ajmer. *Eleven years* passed in this way. Then he once asked his minister Vāgbhaṭa, the son of Udayana, whether there were no deity, Yakṣa or Āsura, who could help him to achieve victory. Vāgbhaṭa advised him to worship an image of Ajitasvāmin which was then obtainable in Aṇhilvāḍ and which had been consecrated by Hemacandra. Kumārapāla consented and offered Ajitasvāmin presents of very rich substances as required by the Jaina-cult. At the same time, he promised that, in case he conquered his enemy through Ajita's grace, the latter alone should be "his God, his mother, his Guru and father". Then he again proceeded towards Mārvāḍ for the twelfth time. The battle took place in the neighbourhood of the mountain Arbuda-Ābū. Arṇorāja was totally beaten. Kumārapāla made a triumphal entry into Aṇhilvāḍ. He did not forget his promise and offered his worship again in the temple of Ajitanātha. Soon afterwards, he proclaimed to his minister that he wanted to be instructed in the Jaina-tenets and asked him to secure him a teacher. Vāgbhaṭa proposed that Hemacandra be invited to fulfil the king's wish. So it came to pass that Hemacandra preached before Kumārapāla with the result that the latter was moved to take the vows of laymen: to renounce eating flesh and all other forbidden foods, and to study the law of the Jainas.[60]

Merutuṅga's narrative differs very much from the above one and is indeed full of romance. According to his account, Kumārapāla had to combat internal enemies immediately after his winning the crown. Then followed the campaign against Arṇorāja or Ānāka of Sapādalakṣa and later a war against Mallikārjuna, the king of Koṅkaṇ, who was beaten by Āmrabhaṭa or Āmbaḍa, the second son of Udayana. Between these two stories, an anecdote is interwoven about the singer, Sollāka, in which Hemacandra also is mentioned. Contradicting this there is also the account of the way and manner in which Hemacandra became the friend and teacher of Kumārapāla. An insult which Hemacandra received at the funeral of his mother Pāhinī from the ascetics of Tripuruṣaprāsāda in Aṇhilvāḍ, drove him-according to Merutuṅga's report-into such anger that he decided to gain influence at the court so that he could take revenge for the insult. He betook himself to the royal camp which happened to be then at Mālvā. His old patron, the councillor Udayana, introduced him to the king. The king remembered his prophecy which Hemacandra had made during his flight. The king offered him his friendship and granted him the honour of access to his person at all times. This intercourse which developed so quickly had, however, no immediate results for the religious conviction of the king. Only a few anecdotes are given, e. g., the one about the quarrel with the Purohita Āmīga (see above p. 20), which prove Hemacandra's dexterity in self-defence against attacks. It was only when Kumārapāla returned sometime afterwards to Aṇhilvāḍ that Hemacandra found an opportunity of beginning his work of conversion. Once Kumārapāla asked his friend, so it is said, how he could immortalize for all time the memory of his rule. Thereupon Hemacandra advised the king either to pay off every one's debts, as Vikramāditya had done, or to have a new stone-temple built in the place of the dilapidated wood-temple of Śiva-Somanātha in Devapattana. Kumārapāla preferred the latter and deputed at once an official to begin the erection. When it was reported that the foundation-stone had been laid, Hemacandra proposed to the king that he should take a vow for securing the happy conclusion of the project, and to that end either to observe complete chastity or to renounce indulgence in spirituous drinks and flesh-eating until the flag was unfurled on the pinnacle of the temple. Kumārapāla swore before a Śiva-liṅga to abstain from the prohibited drinks and dishes for the required length of time. After two years, the temple was completed and Kumārapāla wanted now to be freed from his vow. Hemacandra, however, prevailed upon him to hold the vow still longer, until he had worshipped the god in the new temple. Immediately, therefore, a pilgrimage towards Somanātha-or Devapattana-was undertaken and, on the advice of the envious Brahmins, Hemacandra also was invited thereto. The latter declared himself to be quite willing to visit the temple of Śiva. He however took first a roundabout route so as to visit the shrines of Śatruñjaya and Girnār. At the gate of Devapattana he met the king and took part in the ceremonious entry-procession together with the king and with Gaṇḍa Bṛhaspati, the temple-priest of Somanātha. He was also moved by the request of his lord to worship even Śiva. Dressed in a costly costume, he entered the temple led by Bṛhaspati, praised its brilliance, made the usual sacrificial offerings according to the instructions of the *S'ivapurāṇa* and threw himself prostrate before the Liṅga, dedicating the following verses to the God:

(1) Thou dost exist, whosoever Thou art, whatsoever Thy place, Thy time and Thy name may be! If Thou art the only one, free from stains and errors, then all reverence be to Thee, O Worthy of worship!

(2) Reverence to Him in whom the sorrows and the other causes of the seed of rebirth have vanished: be He Brahman, Viṣṇu or Maheśvara!

When Hemacandra had finished his prayers, Kumārapāla worshipped, on his part, the god according to the instructions of the priest Bṛhaspati and distributed rich presents. Then he ordered his retinue to retire and visited, with Hemacandra, the Holiest of the holy. There he asked his friend to explain before the Liṅga truthfully the way to deliverance. Hemacandra meditated for a moment. Then he proposed to appeal to the god who was verily there, that He might manifest Himself and show the way to deliverance. Hemacandra himself undertook to sink into the deepest meditation in order to attain the desired end. He instructed the king to bring immediately incense-offering of aloe-wood. As both of them thus were so busy and the adytum was filled with smoke-clouds, there, appeared all of a sudden a bright light and the beaming form of an ascetic was visible on the water-basin around the Liṅga. The king touched the apparition from its feet up to its head and having convinced himself that it was of divine origin, requested it for advice. Thereupon it told him that Hemacandra would surely lead him to deliverance. The apparition disappeared. The king then requested Hemacandra in all humility for instruction. The latter at once made him take a vow that he would never touch during all his lifetime either meat or spirituous drinks. After a short time, Kumārapāla returned to Aṇhilvāḍ. He was won over more and more to the Jaina faith through Hemacandra's instructions in the holy scriptures as well as through his works, the *Triṣaṣṭiś'alākāpuruṣacaritra* and the *Yogas'āstra* and the twenty *stavas* composed in honour of Vītarāga. Kumārapāla also received the title of Paramārhata, "the eager worshipper of the Arhata". He then promulgated an edict prohibiting the killing of animals for fourteen years in the eighteen provinces subject to him. He had 1440 Jaina temples built and took the twelve vows of Jaina-layman. When the third one, prohibiting stealing, was explained to him, he at once decided to break the old custom of confiscating the property of those subjects who had died without leaving an heir.[61]

Jinamaṇḍana essentially agrees with Merutuṅga. But he felt the inner contradiction which the story of the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* as well as that of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* contained. It appeared to him as unbelievable that Hemacandra who had helped Kumārapāla on his flight and had prophesied his ascending the throne, should have been afterwards forgotten for so many years and that he could have obtained access to the court only through the intervention of the Jaina minister. He has therefore interwoven a new story at the beginning of his account. The story is to show that Hemacandra went to the court very soon after Kumārapāla's coronation. This story, however, betrays quite clearly that the author had the knowledge of the older accounts and that he had changed them deliberately. After enumerating the presents which were given to the councillor Udayana and to the other benefactors of the king, he

says, Hemacandra was absolutely forgotten. Inspite of that, he went to Aṇhilvāḍ from Karṇāvatī a short time after Kumārapāla's coronation. He then asked Udayana whether the king remembered him. As the reply was in the negative, he requested Udayana to warn the king against visiting on a certain day the palace of his queen. He also permitted Udayana to mention his name in case the king insisted on knowing the name of the warner. Udayana brought home the warning to the king who acted accordingly. On the said day, the palace of the queen caught fire from lightning and was burnt to ashes. Thereupon the king asked the name of the unknown adviser. When Hemacandra's name was mentioned, he was at once summoned by the king who promptly begged to be excused in all humility for his forgetfulness and promised him to rule entirely according to his counsel.[62] After showing that Hemacandra became Kumārapāla's friend and advisor soon after V. S. 1199, Jinamaṇḍana gives a short account of "the conquest of the world" by the king. In the subsequent account he follows wholly and literally Merutuṅga, excepting, of course, in one point, that is, he says nothing about the insult hurled at Hemacandra at the funeral of Pāhiṇī and about the subsequent journey to Mālvā. The statements naturally did not suit him. In some details, he is more extensive than Merutuṅga and lengthens the account of Kumārapāla's conversion very much by many quotations which he attributes to Hemacandra.[63]

CHAPTER VI

Hemacandra's own Account of Kumārapāla's Conversion

If we compare these various stories about Kumārapāla's conversion with each other, it cannot be denied that the one given by Merutuṅga is written with very great dexterity and that his presentation is at first sight very attractive. It appears so natural that because of an insult from a Brahmin, Hemacandra should have thought of giving up his independence and placing himself under the protection of the king. The clever way in which he moves Kumārapāla for a certain time to follow some of the most important tenets of Jainism while at the same time he takes care not to put anything in the way of his patron's reverence to Śiva,-in fact he greatly encourages him in that,-betrays clearly the difficult situation in which he found himself in the court. This adaptation and apparent relaxation, the fooling of the king by a hocus-pocus and the subsequent clever exploitation of the favourable moment-all this seems quite credible and fits in very well with the character and the method of the Jaina-missionaries. On closer examination, however, many improbabilities or impossibilities are found in the account. It is easy to recognise, for example, that Merutuṅga indulges in an awful anachronism when he assumes that Udayana was Kumārapāla's minister and introduced Hemacandra to the king. According to Merutuṅga's own account (p. 9), Udayana came to Gujarat shortly after the beginning of Jayasiṁha's rule i. e. about V. S. 1150. Kumārapāla ascended the throne about 50 years later, in V. S. 1199. It is then simply impossible that he could have lived still for any length of time under Kumārapāla or that he could ever have served him. Merutuṅga's assumption, too, that Hemacandra advised the rebuilding of the temple in Devapattana, does not at all agree with the statements in an older document. For, in the inscription dated Valabhī-Saṁvat 850 or V. S. 1225 in the temple of Bhadrakālī at Devapattana, which was first of all made known by Colonel J. Tod, it is quite explicitly said in the 11th verse that the Gaṇḍa Bṛhaspati, who had already been in great favour with Jayasiṁha, persuaded Kumārapāla to rebuild the ruined temple of Śiva-Somanātha.[64] Such an assumption has, since it dates from the time of Kumārapāla's reign, significantly far more probability than Merutuṅga's much later statement. If this inscription be in the right, then the whole further narrative of the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* becomes unbelievable. If ever these points raise suspicion against the faithfulness of the tradition contained in Merutuṅga's works, then the same

tradition and also the narrative of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* prove as almost completely worthless in light of Hemacandra's own utterances about Kumārapāla's history and his relationship to him. Hemacandra devotes no less than four *sargas* XVI–XIX in the *Dvyās'rayakāvya* to the description of the successful war which Kumārapāla led against Arṇorāja, king of Śākambharī–Sāmbhar in Rājputānā, and against Ballāla, king of Mālvā. Although no definite dates are given, it may yet be taken as certain from the description that Kumārapāla was involved in external complications soon after his coronation and that a considerable time had passed before he emerged successfully from them. The war with Arṇōrāja began immediately after Kumārapāla's coronation and appears to have lasted for a considerable number of years. Soon afterwards followed the campaign against Ballāla, which appears to have ended in a shorter time. After this was over, so it is said in the XX *sarga*, Kumārapāla prohibited killing of animals in Gujarat. After the king had published the edict to protect the animals, it is said further, he gave up the custom of confiscating the property of those who died without leaving behind an heir. Later on, he had the temple of Śiva at Kedāra or Kedārnātha in Garhwal and at Devapattana in Kāṭhiāvāḍ rebuilt, and thereupon he had the temple of Pārśvanātha in Aṇhilvāḍ and Devapattana erected, the former of which bore the name Kumāravihāra. The last events of the time of Kumārapāla's reign, as mentioned in the *Dvyās'raya*, are the building of a temple of Śiva in Aṇhilvāḍ and the foundation of a new era which bore his name.[65] From these statements one may conclude with absolute certainty that Kumārapāla's conversion to Jainism took place after the war with Mālvā. It also becomes probable that Hemacandra, although he does not touch upon his own relationship to the king by a single word in the *Dvyās'raya*, was acquainted with the king earlier and had influence over him. The latter conclusion is fully corroborated by a passage in another work of Hemacandra. In his *Mahāvīracarita* Hemacandra makes Tīrthaṅkara deliver a prophecy on Kumārapāla's reign to Prince Abhaya, in which his name occurs and in which the beginning of his acquaintance with the king is related. After Mahāvīra's preliminary description of the city of Aṇhilvāḍ, he proceeds further as follows:

45–46. When, O Abhaya, 1669 years will have passed after my Nirvāṇa, then there will live in that city (Aṇhilvāḍ) the long-armed king Kumārapāla, the moon of the Caulukya–line, a powerful lord of all.

47. This large-hearted one, a hero in the fulfilment of the law, in generosity and in the battle, will lead his people to the highest prosperity, protecting it as a father.

48. Very clever and yet of upright mind, in his majesty fiery as the sun and yet filled with the peace of the soul, punishing arrogant attacks and yet always ready to forgive, he will protect the world for a long time.

49. He will make his people like unto himself, firm in the fulfilment of the law, even as a wise teacher trains a good pupil.

50. Granting protection to those who seek it, and like as a brother to the wives of other men, he will esteem the sacred law above riches and as life.

51. On account of his bravery, his fulfilment of the law, his generosity, his mercy, his might and other manly virtues, he will stand without a rival.

52. He will conquer the region of Kubera as far as the kingdom of the *Turuṣkas*, that of Indra as far as the river of gods, that of Yama as far as the Vindhya, and the west as far as the ocean.

53. Once this prince will see the teacher Hemacandra, who has arisen from the race of Municandra in the Vajraśākhā.

54. Delighted at the sight of him, as the peacock is delighted at the appearance of the clouds, this good man will hasten to do honour daily to that monk.

55. This king will go with his minister of the Jaina faith to honour that Sūri whilst the latter is preaching in the temple of the Jina about the sacred law.

56. There he will, though ignorant of the truth, pray to the god, and honour that teacher with a naturally pure heart.

57. After he has heard with delight the noble sermon about the law from his lips, he will take the minor vows and will then strive after the vow of perfection.

58. After enlightenment has come to him, he will fully learn the life of the faithful, and, resting in the audience-chamber, will ever delight himself with the speeches about the sacred law.[66]

This prophecy agrees excellently with the statements of the *Dvyāśrayakāvya* and completes the same. The somewhat poetically coloured description of the frontiers of the Gujarat Empire gives us clearly to understand that it extended in the north-east by overthrowing the Sapādalakṣa or in the eastern Rājputānā by defeating Sākambharī-Sāmbhar and in the south-east by conquering Mālvā. Kumārapāla's acquaintance with Hemacandra began, according to the verse 53, in the time when the empire had achieved its greatest expansion and when the war-expeditions and conquests were over. His conversion was the result of a sermon preached by Hemacandra when he had gone to the Jaina temple in the company of an unnamed minister in order to pay his homage to the monk who had made a deep impression on him.

These statements of Hemacandra himself make it first of all necessary to reject as fanciful all the above-described anecdotes as to his earlier relations with Kumārapāla during his flight. The anecdotes were composed probably with a view to motivating the later relationship. They show, moreover, that the further accounts of the *Prabandhas* as to the renewal of the acquaintance and the conversion contain in them little historical element. The above-given narrative of the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, according to which Kumārapāla was moved by his minister Vāgbhaṭa to invoke Ajitasvāmin to help him against Arṇorāja and was converted to Jainism by reason of the fulfilment of his prayer, cannot be true, for the war with Mālvā, which is not mentioned in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, took place even before the conversion; so that it was not awe at Hemacandra's miraculous powers but appreciation of his life and teachings that induced the king to listen to

Hemacandra's sermons. Merutuṅga's detailed account contradicts Hemacandra's own account still more, as may easily be seen. There are only two points in which the *Prabandhas* agree to some extent with Hemacandra, thereby preserving real tradition. In the first place, they are no doubt correct when they state that Kumārapāla's Jaina minister introduced Hemacandra to the court and was interested in creating favourable ground for his faith. For, the mention of the "Jaina" minister, who according to the *Mahāvīracarita* accompanied the king to the temple, is not made without any reason. We may take it for granted that it was this Jaina companion who occasioned Hemacandra's acquaintance with the king and who induced the latter to visit the temple. Most probably the minister was Vāgbhaṭa, son of Udayana, whom the *Prabhāvakacaritra* mentions in the above-mentioned narrative of conversion. The poem in praise of the Kumāravihāra written by Hemacandra's pupil Vardhamāna testifies that Vāgbhaṭa really belonged to the group of the ministers of Kumārapāla. Several stories of the *Prabandhas* maintain that Hemacandra consecrated either in V. S. 1211 or 1213 the temple which Vāgbhaṭa had built in Śatruñjaya in memory of his father who had fallen in the battle against Navaghaṇa, the Cūḍāsamā king of Vāmanasthalī. One *Prabandha* says, further, that Hemacandra did the same service in V. S. 1220 to Āmrabhaṭa, second son of Udayana, for his temple of Suvrata in Broach, whereas the other *Prabandhas* (see under) relate a legend about Hemacandra's healing of Āmrabhaṭa.[67] If to this be added Merutuṅga's statement, even though an anachronism, that Hemacandra was introduced to Kumārapāla by the father of both the brothers (p. 29), then it does not seem too bold to regard the family of Udayana as the prime cause of Hemacandra's influence at the court of Aṇhilvāḍ and to regard him as the family's particular protègè. A second historical element in the stories of the *Prabandhas* is the statement that Kumārapāla's conversion took place, not in the beginning but about the middle of his reign. Here also they agree, as has been shown, with Hemacandra's statements.

The exact date of this event appears to have been preserved in the drama, already referred to above, the *Moharājaparājaya* by the councillor Yaśaḥpāla. The conversion of the king is allegorically mentioned as his marriage with the princess Kṛpāsundarī *i. e.* the beautiful Mercy, the daughter of Dharmarāja and the Viratidevī. Hemacandra is mentioned as the Priest who ordained the marriage tie before Arhat. According to the quotation of Jinamaṇḍana from the *Moharājaparājaya*, this marriage took place in V. S. 1216, Mārga sudi 2. If, as may be well supposed, this date really occurred in the drama, then it must be taken as authentic, for the *Moharājaparājaya* was written, as is shown in the Note 6, a few years after the death of Kumārapāla, between V. S. 1229 and 1232.[68] We may also add to this that Kumārapāla received the title *Paramas'rāvaka* i. e. 'the most eager hearer (of the Jaina-doctrine)', in the colophon of an old MS. which was written five years later, in V. S. 1221; while his conversion is not mentioned in a Jaina-inscription of V. S. 1213.[69]

If we accept now V. S. 1216 as the date of Kumārapāla's conversion, then we may place his first meeting with Hemacandra one or two years earlier. Even if the *Mahāvīracarita* assumes that the king, after coming to know the distinguished Teacher, "will hasten to revere him daily", it is of no avail to weigh these words as of gold. It

must have taken a long period of secret intrigue before the king allowed himself to visit the Jaina Upāśraya and to sit at the feet of Hemacandra as a listener to the sermon. However, as to the manner in which the gradual friendship was formed and how Hemacandra won the favour and the confidence of the king, we may at least put forward certain assumptions, not wholly baseless, with the help of some suggestions from his other works, even though we may fail to attain full certainty. But before these remarks are made, it is necessary to go over Hemacandra's activities during the period from V. S. 1199, the year of Jayasiṁha's death, until his acquaintance with Kumārapāla in V. S. 1214 or V. S. 1215.

As has been said above on p. 18, Hemacandra had undertaken, after his appointment as the Court-Paṇdit about V. S. 1194, the task of writing a complete series of manuals for the worldly sciences and specially for Sanskrit Composition. Of these, the Grammar and its appendices with the commentary, parhaps also both of the Sanskrit Lexica and the first fourteen cantos of the *Dvyās'rayakāvya* were completed before Jayasiṁha's death. After V. S. 1199 he appears to have pursued his plan further without worrying the loss of his position in the court, and worked on tirelessly as a private scholar. The first work belonging to this period, is his Manual of Poetics, the *Alaṁkāracūdāmaṇi*.[69a] In the above-mentioned (Note 38) passage of the same it is said that it was written after the completion of the Grammer, and another very striking circumstance shows quite clearly that its compilation took place at a time when the author did not enjoy royal favour. For, the dedication, the compliment to the ruler of Gujarat, is lacking not only in the text but also in the commentary which contains a great number of verses. This latter point is all the more weighty as it was a fashion of the court-writers on poetics always to add verses in honour of their patrons. And Hemacandra himself is no exception, for we find him missing no opportunity of flattering his lord in two of his other works. The one case in point occurring in the Commentary on his Grammar was mentioned above. The second one will be forthwith discussed. Particularly in a work on Poetics it would have been easy to celebrate the heroic deeds of Jayasiṁha or Kumārapāla in the same way as is done by the older Vāgbhaṭa in his *Alaṁkāras'āstra.*[70] As, however, this does not happen, it can well be supposed that the author at the time of writing the work, had no connection with the king and it is not hard to determine that that was the period between Jayasiṁha's death and the beginning of the acquaintance with Kumārapāla. The same is true about the *Chandonus'āsana,*[71] the work on Metrics, which was written, as is evident from the introductory verses, immediately after the *Alaṁkāracūdāmaṇi;* as also about the Commentary belonging to it. Here, too, we miss the dedication and the compliments to the king in the illustrations. Moreover, it is to be noted that the texts of both of these manuals were first finished and the commentary on the *Alaṁkāracūdāmaṇi* was written just after the completion of the *Chandonus'āsana.* This is evident from the fact that Hemacandra refers to the latter in the former and speaks of it as a completed work.[72] Also numerous supplements to both the great Sanskrit *Koṣas* had their origin in that period as well as, surely, the text of the Prakrit Lexicon, the *Des'ināmamālā* or *Ratnāvali.* To the supplements belongs, first of all, the *S'eṣākhyā Nāmamālā* which purports to complete the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi,* and which contains particularly extracts from Yādavaprakāśa's *Vaijayanti.*[73] Then the *Nighaṇṭu* or *Nighaṇṭus'eṣa,*

known so little as yet, is to be mentioned. The tradition of the Jaina-scholars assumes that Hemacandra wrote six small works of this name. However, only three of them are so far discovered. Two give short survey of botanic names while the third deals with precious stones.[74] It is not improbable that these works were written in imitation of the older *Dhanvantarinighaṇṭu* and the *Ratnaparīkṣā*. Also in these works one misses that hint that they were written at the king's command. However, a doubt may be raised at least with regard to the *Śeṣākhyā Nāmamālā*, whether it was written between V. S. 1199 and 1214/15, for the same has been inserted in many MSS. in the Commentary of the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* and this latter belongs, as will be shown below, to the last years of Hemacandra's life. The *Deśīnāmamālā*, on the other hand, was probably written shortly before Hemacandra's acquaintance with Kumārapāla. For, Hemacandra suggests in the third verse of the Introduction and says in the explanation of the same verse (pp. 2–3) quite expressly that he had previously completed not only his Grammar but also his Sanskrit-Koṣas and his Manual of Poetics. On the other hand, the commentary, which was certainly written later, contains no less than fifteen verses in which the king is mentioned by name, while in nine others the designation Cālukya or Culukya occurs and a great number of them are addressed simply to the king. These verses, all of which are applicable to Kumārapāla, praise his heroic deeds, describe the greatness of his glory and the misery of his foes, or praise his generosity. In one place, there seems also an allusion to a particular historical event. It is said in VI, 118:

"O Thou, whose courage emits unbroken sparks, O Lord of the goddess of Victory, does not thy fame ramble about freely, just like an unchaste Cāṇḍāla-woman, even in the Palli-land"?[75]

The Palli-land is the district of Pālī in Rājputānā between Jodhpur and Ajmer. It is to be recognised, therefore, that in this verse there is an allusion to Kumārapāla's victory over Arṇorāja, the king of Sapādalakṣa, or Śākambharī-Sāmbhar.

Whatever may be thought of this verse, there remains, however, the very conspicuous fact that Hemacandra in the Commentary to his *Deśīnāmamālā* glorifies only the victory and the bravery of Kumārapāla but does not speak of his piety and of his faith in the Jaina tenets. This fact strengthens the conclusion that this work was written after Hemacandra had obtained access to Kumārapāla's court, but before he began his work of conversion. Therefore, the date of the compilation of the Commentary must roughly be V.S. 1214-15. The above-mentioned fact further gives a scent as to the way and manner in which Hemacandra began to win the favour of the king. First of all, he appears to have made use of his temporal art and worldly knowledge to create a favourable impression. After his introduction by his patron, the minister Vāgbhaṭa, he probably received the permission to appear at the usual daily audience of the scholars. His position is naturally prominent from the outset. His reputation as a scholar had been for long firmly established and it could not have failed to influence Kumārapāla, even if the latter began to study, as an anecdote given by Merutuṅga reports, the sciences just in his old age. Hemacandra would certainly not have hidden his light under a bushel but would have rediated it through his deep erudition at the discussions of the scholars in the king's presence. Apart from the strictly scientific accomplishments, he undoubtedly influenced the king

by his panegyrics on Kumārapāla's war-activities of which the verses partly very cleverly composed in the commentary on the *Des'īnāmamālā* give examples. There was probably no lack of opportunity for religious discussions at the Court. According to all accounts, Kumārapāla was about fifty years old when he ascended the throne and when the completion of his war-expeditions allowed him to take rest, he had attained his sixty-third year. That at such an age he turned to religious questions can well be understood, this being usual especially in the case of Indians. Moreover, be it noted that for years he wandered here and there, as the *Prabandhas* would have us believe, as a Śivaite ascetic and that he, as Hemacandra says in the *Yogas'āstra* (see Note 80), had "seen" various manuals of the Yoga and took great interest in the Yogic practices of the ascetics, which would first of all bring supernatural powers and finally would lead to deliverance. Hemacandra also was very expert in these doctrines, as his last-named work shows, and he appears to have performed the prescribed spiritual exercises himself for he bases his description of the practices on personal experience (Note 80). So far, the circumstances were well favourable to persuade even a king to abandon Śaivism to which his race had paid homage from time immemorial and to go over to the heterodox Jaina sect which was very influencial and had been honoured in Gujarat for many years.[77] As his works show, Hemacandra was never in want of skill. He probably began with caution and, as the *Prabandhas* state, he emphasised wherever possible the harmony between the doctrines of Jainism and those of the orthodox systems. The *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 124 ff., particularly gives long sermons in extenso, in which Hemacandra attempts to prove the identity of Jina and Śiva as well as Viṣṇu, and refers to the canonical works of the Brahmins for the doctrine of preserving the life of animals. However little one may rely on the wording of these and similar passages, they without doubt clearly show the way in which Hemacandra approached the works. For, in the commentary on his *Yogas'āstra* he cites among other things, passages from the Brahmanical works, with the introductory words: "So say even the believers of false doctrines," in confirmation of the Jaina doctrines, and also in the text of this work (III, 21,26), Manu's words against meat-eating, with mention of his name, are given. There is, however, no trace in his works of an identification of the Brahmanical gods with the Jinas. In spite of this, it is quite possible that he made use of them in his sermons; they were usual even in the 12th century. In the *Maṅgala* to the Nāṁḍol deed of presentation of the princes Alhaṇa and Kelhaṇa of V. S. 1218, we read :

"To liberation may also the gods Brahman, Śrīdhara and Śaṅkara lead [us,] who, always renouncing passions, are known in the world as Jinas !"

However, Hemacandra's task had been troublesome and success did not crown it so rapidly as too strict an interpretation of the above-mentioned passage from the *Mahāvīracarita* would have us believe. It is particularly likely that, as the *Prabandhas* relate, Hemacandra was continually disturbed in his work by hostile influences and that all the Brahmins were bent upon to counteract his influence over the king and, above all, to hinder the formal conversion of the latter. Merutuṅga's above-mentioned anecdotes, according to which malicious and envious people set traps for Hemacandra, describe the general situation quite rightly, even if one might not agree in details. In the same way

Jinamaṇḍana's story, which relates that Rājācārya Devabodhi, the spiritual instructor of the king, champions the old religion, may have an historical basis despite the fact that the story in its present setting is purely mythical.[78] The event most probably did not take place without a hard fight. Without doubt, the already mentioned *Yogas'āstra* particularly played a very essential part in keeping Kumārapāla firm in his new faith, as is mentioned in the *Prabandhas.*[79] Hemacandra wrote it under order of his lord.[80] In the concluding stanza of the work, XII, 55, it is said:

"This secret doctrine of Yoga, which–a part here and a part there–has been learnt from the holy scriptures, from the mouth of a good teacher and from one's own experience and which rouses wonder in the minds of the competent public, has been dressed in words by the teacher Hemacandra as a result of the earnest request of the illustrious Caulukya king Kumārapāla."

The same thing is expressed in the two stanzas at the end of the commentary, which immediately follow the above ones.

1. "Owing to the request which the illustrious Caulukya king made to me, I wrote this commentary on the *Manual of Yoga*–so named by me–an ocean of the Nectar of Truth. May it enjoy (its existence) so long as these three worlds–Earth, Air and Heaven–possess the Jaina-doctrine."

2. "Through the merit which I attained by the *Manual of Yoga* and its exposition, may the good man be induced to win for himself the enlightenment of Jina."

Also in the colophon to each of the twelve *Prakās'as*, each time is it mentioned that Kumārapāla wished to hear the work and that it was "crowned" (*saṁjātapaṭṭabandha*), that is, it received the royal approbation. The first four chapters, already published, which form more than three-fourths of the whole, give a short resumé of the Jaina-doctrine, particularly as it affects the position of layman, and the very extensive commentary enlarges the same to the most lucid and comprehensible exposition of the system which has ever been written. The author clearly indicates that this part is written with a view to instructing his lord for, in the commentary, he often particularly and exhaustively dwells upon the duties of a Jaina king. The last eight *Prakās'as* deal with the actual Yoga, the ascetic practices which lead finally to *mukti* or deliverance. The exposition of this part, after which the work is in fact named, is very short and only occupies something like a tenth of the whole *Vṛtti*. It is remarkable that a very long description of those practices precedes the Jaina–Yoga, which, in the author's own words, are useless for attaining *mukti*, but which afford, on the contrary, a peep into the future and grant supernatural powers. It appears that Hemacandra also believed in their efficacy and perhaps devoted himself to them. If he finds so much place as one long chapter for their description, it must have been in consideration of the excessive love of the king for the Yoga–praxis about which he relates in the commentary on XII,55. The *Vītarāgastotra* which was similarly composed for Kumārapāla, perhaps even earlier than the *Yogas'āstra*,

might have received less significance. It gives a short presentation of the Jaina-tenets in the form of a *Pras'asti* to Jina.[31] The text of the *Yogas'āstra*, as also the *Vītarāgastotra*, was probably written shortly after V. S. 1216. The commentary, on the other hand, was probably completed a few years later. The very significant extent of the latter leads us to suppose that Hemacandra worked on it for a considerable time even if he were ever so diligent and even if he had taken the help of his pupils.

CHAPTER VII

The Consequences of Kumārapāla's Conversion

Now, in regard to the question, what practical results Hemacandra achieved through Kumārapāla's conversion, the prophecy in the *Mahāvīracarita* gives a very clear answer, besides the above-mentioned (p. 33) information in the *Dvyāśrayakāvya*. The prophecy continues after the description of the conversion, already noted, as follows :-

59. "He (Kumārapāla) will keep everyday to the vows, particularly to those relating to rice, vegetables, fruits and others (other foods), and will generally practise chastity."

60. "This wise man will not only avoid courtesans, but will admonish his lawful wives to practise chastity."

61. "According to the instruction of that monk (Hemacandra), he, who knows the general principles (of the faith), the doctrine of that which has soul and of that which has no soul, and so forth, will, like a teacher, procure enlightenment for others also."

62. "Even the Brāhmaṇas of the Pāṇḍuraṅga (sect) and others, who hate the *Arhat*, will, at his command, become equal to those who are born in the faith."

63. "This man, learned in the law, will, after having taken the vow of a believer, not take his meals without having worshipped in the Jaina temples and without having bowed before the teachers."

64. "He will not take the property of men who have died without leaving sons. That is the result of right insight: for, (only) those without insight are never satisfied."

65. "He himself will give up hunting, which even the Pāṇḍus and others (pious kings of ancient times) did not give up; and all other people will give it up at his command."

66. "As he has prohibited the harming of living creatures, there can be no thought of injury and other things like that; even a man of the lowest birth will not kill even bugs, lice and the like (insects)."

67. "After he has forbidden hunting, game of all kinds will chew the cud in the forest, undisturbed as cows in the cow-shed."

68. "He, who equals Indra in might, will always insist upon the care of all living beings, whether they live in water, on land or in air."

69. "Even the creatures which eat meat from their birth will, as a result of his command, forget the very mention of meat like an evil dream."

70. "Spirituous drinks (the enjoyment of which) has not been given up by the Daśārhas, though they believe in the Jina, will be prohibited everywhere by this (prince) with the pure soul."

71. "So thoroughly will he stop the preparation of spirituous drinks throughout the world, that even the potter will no longer make liquor jugs."

72. "The drunkards, who are impoverished because of their passion for intoxicants, will prosper again, after they have given up drink at his command."

73. "He will destroy the very name of the game of dice, which Nala and other princes had not given up, like the name of a personal foe."

74. "So long as his glorious reign lasts, there will be no pigeon-race and no cock-fights."

75. "In almost every village, he, whose wealth is immeasurable, will adorn the earth with temples of Jina."

76. "On the whole earth, as far as the ocean, he will cause the statues of the Arhat to be borne in procession on cars, in every village, in every town."

77. "After he had continually given money away, and redeemed every one's debts, he will introduce his era on the earth."

78. "Once he will hear, on the occasion of a story related through the mouth of his teacher, about that (Jina-) statue buried in the dust, which the seer Kapila consecrated."

79. "Then he will form the desire: 'I shall dig up the sandy place, and shall have the all-consecrating statue brought hither'."

80. "When the king is conscious of such great enthusiasm, and also learns of other auspicious signs, then he will be convinced that the statue will reach his hands."

81. "Then, after obtaining the permission of his teacher, he will give the order to his officials to dig up that place of Vītabhaya."

82. "Then, as a result of the purity of the king, who is faithful in his devotion to the Arhat, the goddess, who keeps a watch over the holy doctrine, will appear."

83. "As a result of the extremely great merit of the king Kumārapāla, the statue will soon come to light, when the place is excavated."

84. "Then, too, the grant of villages, which king Udayana had made to this statue, will come to light."

85. "The king's officials will place this old statue in a car, as if it were a new one, after having done honour to it as is prescribed."

86. "Whilst, on the way, divine service of various kinds is being held, whilst concerts are being given day and night without interruption,"

87. "Whilst the women of the villages clap their hands loudly and rejoice, whilst the five-toned drums sound joyously,"

88. "Whilst the fans rise and fall on either side, the officials will convey this holy statue to the boundary of Pattana."

89. "Accompanied by the ladies of his palace and his servants, surrounded by the four columns of his host, the king will go to meet it with the whole community."

90. "Dismounting from his chariot himself and mounting the state elephant, the prince will escort the image into the city."

91. "After Kumārapāla has erected it in a pleasure-house near his palace, he will pay homage to it, as prescribed, morning, noon and night."

92. "After he has read the grant made to the statue, he will confirm that which was given by Udayana."

93. "That temple built solely of gold, O Crown Prince, as its splendour appears to be incredible, will arouse the wonder of the whole world."

94. "After the statue has been erected within it, the prince will increase in might, wealth and highest happiness."

95. "Through his devotion to the gods, through his devotion to the teacher, King Kumārapāla will resemble thy father, O Abhaya, in the Bhārata land."

If we now compare these statements with those of the *Dvyās'rayakāvya*,[82] we see that Kumārapāla strove after making Gujarat, in certain respects, a model Jaina-state. He renounced not only for himself the enjoyments and pleasures prohibited by the Jaina-doctrine but he induced also his subjects to impose upon themselves the same privations. He issued an ordinance which required the protection of the animal life to the greatest extent, and which was applied most vigorously in all parts of his empire. The Brahmins who killed animals while performing sacrifices were, as the *Dvyās'raya* says, forced to give up the practice and to use corn instead of flesh. Also in the Pallideśa in Rājputānā one had to submit to that ordinance, and the ascetics of that region, who used to wear antelope-skin, found it hard to procure the same. So it happened, as is said in the *Mahāvīracarita*, that Paṇḍuraṅgas, i. e. Śivaites, and other Brahmins had to live like born Śravakas. Prohibition of hunting, about which the latter work speaks, was the natural consequence of this edict and, according to the *Dvyās'raya*, even the inhabitants

of the Pāñcāladeśa, that is, the tribes of the middle Kāṭhiāvāḍ, who were great offenders, had to bow to the same order. A further result was the measure, mentioned in the *Dvyāś'raya,* against the butchers who had to give up their trade and received as compensation a lump sum of their three years' income. According to the *Mahāvīracarita* the protection of animal life was extended even to noxious insects. If we trust Merutuṅga, this statement is no exaggeration at all. For, he describes in the *Yūkāvihāraprabandha*[33] how a "simple-minded" merchant, in the land of Sapādalakṣa, who had crushed a louse, was dragged to Aṇhilvāḍ by the officer in charge of enforcing the law for the protection of animals, and how, as a punishment for his offence, he had to build the *Yūkāvihāra* at the cost of the whole of his fortune. Out of all proportion as this punishment may seem, it was merciful in comparison with the punishment which, according to the *Prabhāvaka-caritra,* was incurred by Lakṣa, the bearer of the betel-bowl of Kelhaṇa, the Prince of Naḍūla-Nāṁḍol. When it was known that Lakṣa had placed a dish of raw meat before the Lokāloka-Chaitya in Aṇhilvāḍ, he was sentenced to death.

Along with the prohibition of meat-eating, spirituous drinks were also forbidden in conformity with the second Jaina 'Guṇavrata.' The same is the case with the game of dice, animal fights and betting which last the third 'Guṇavrata' designates as abominable. The *Dvyāś'rayakāvya* says nothing about the edicts regarding these two points. They are, however, mentioned in the *Prabandhas.*[34] As the above-mentioned story by Merutuṅga shows, and as Jinamaṇḍana expressly corroborates it, Kumārapāla appointed special officers to enforce the execution of his edicts. Finally, of very great significance for the Jaina community was the law abolishing the practice of confiscating the property of those merchants who left behind them no sons, but widows. It appears that this cruel custom, which contradicts the principles of the *Smṛtis,* prevailed from ancient times in various provinces, particularly in the west of India. Already Kālidāsa, whose home was Mālvā bordering on Gujarat, knows of this custom and mentions it in the *Abhijñānaś'ākuntala.* There the minister informs the king Duṣyanta that the merchant Dhanavṛddhi has perished in a shipwreck and that as he has left no direct descendants (*anapatya*), his property of many millions must be confiscated for the royal treasury. Duṣyanta, who is of yielding nature owing to his own childlessness, declares first of all that he will give up his claim in favour of a pregnant wife of the deceased, but reconsiders the matter afterwards and issues an edict abolishing such confiscations altogether. From this story, which surely does not belong to the old Śakuntalā-saga but was invented by Kālidāsa, one may certainly conclude that the confiscation of the property of childless merchants was in vogue in the sixth century of the Christian era, at least in the birthplace of the poet. It is evidently clear that this custom hit the Jainas particularly hard for the majority of them lived by commerce and money-transactions. The orthodox kings would probably have treated them, without consideration, as heretics. One can therefore easily understand that Kumārapāla's decision, as is said in the *Dvyāś'rayamahākāvya,* was greeted with great enthusiasm and that not only the *Prabandhas* but also the Brāhmin Someśvara in the *Kīrtikaumudī* highly praised the king.[35]

Apart from these coercive measures, Kumārapāla proved his zeal for the Jaina-faith by building temples, by at least one grant of land, and by his placing the Jaina-cult

on a perfectly equal footing with the Brahmanical fellowships of faith. This last point is mentioned only in the *Mahāvīracarita*; verse 76 says that Kumārapāla everywhere "ordered to carry in a procession the statues of the Arhat in solemn dresses on cars." We must understand this expression in this way that the king did not himself institute Jaina-Rathayātrās in all places but he gave permission to celebrate these to the small communities throughout the country. As is well-known, Indians are never so enthusiastic as when they carry in public processions images of gods placed on high cars. Now the minority sects are, whenever possible, prevented to carry on their *yātrās* by those in majority and particularly the Jainas suffer in this respect from the pressure of other sects. Even in recent years there took place a keen fight in Delhi between the Vaiṣṇavas and the Digambaras on account of the *rathayātrā* which the latter wanted to organize. There is no doubt that during the time of the orthodox kings, the Śvetāmbaras of Gujarat were not permitted to exhibit their divine images in public and that Kumārapāla was the first king to grant that privilege to them. If this explanation be accepted, the assertion of the *Mahāvīracarita* that the *rathayātrās* took place in every village is not unbelievable. For, almost every village in Gujarat has its small Jaina *saṁgha* which consists of dealers in money and merchants. As regards the temple-buildings, the *Dvyās'rayakāvya* speaks of only two, namely, the Kumāravihāra in Aṇhilvāḍ and another, also equally important, in Devapattana. The *Mahāvīracarita*, on the contrary, opines in verse 75 that "almost every" village maintained a Jaina Caitya, but it refers particularly to a single one in Aṇhilvāḍ, which must be the Kumāravihāra. The first assertion is naturally an exaggeration as befits the prophetic style. One must understand the statements of the *Mahāvīracarita* probably to mean that Kumārapāla had a great number of small public edifices erected, which apparently were not important enough to be given separate names, and, besides these, the great, beautiful temple in Aṇhilvāḍ. With the help of this interpretation, the temples mentioned in the *Mahāvīracarita* may well be reconciled with those mentioned in the *Dvyās'raya*, if we accept that the latter wants to mention only the most noteworthy edifices and that it was written somewhat later than the *Mahāvīracarita*. The *Prabandhas* also mention many of these temples. The *Prabhāvakacaritra* speaks, first of all, of the Kumāravihāra at Aṇhilvāḍ, whose foundation it ascribes to the minister Vāgbhaṭa. Afterwards, it relates that the king ordered to be erected 32 small Vihāras as penance for the sins of his teeth; that he erected moreover a statue of Neminātha in the temple of his father, Tihuṇapāla or Tribhuvanapāla; that he had a temple built on the mountain Śatruñjaya; and that he adorned all *des'asthānas*, i. e. the main places in each province, with the Jaina-Caityas. Right at the end of this work, we find also the story from the *Mahāvīracarita* about the discovery of the image of the Arhat in the ruins of Vītabhaya.[56]

Merutuṅga's numbers are still greater. First of all he speaks about 1440 temples which were built in various provinces. Further on, it is said that Kumārapāla had in Vāgbhaṭapura near Śatruñjaya an image of Pārśvanātha erected in a temple, Tribhuvanpālavihāra, so named in honour of his father. Then, the thirty-two 'atonement' temples are also mentioned, as also the Kumāravihāra whose building, however, is not described. Finally, four more temples are mentioned: (1) the Mūṣakavihāra which was built at Aṇhilvāḍ in order to atone for the death of a mouse which died out of despair

because Kumārapāla had deprived it of its prize on his flight from Jayasiṁha; (2) the Karambavihāra which was built in Aṇhilvāḍ in honour of an unknown woman who had fed Kumārapāla with a rice dish on his flight; (3) the Dīkṣāvihāra, the restoration of an old temple in Sāligavasahikā at Cambay, where Hemacandra was consecrated to be a monk and, (4) the Jholikāvihāra, the Cradle-temple, which Kumārapāla ordered to be built in Dhandhūka at the place of Hemacandra's birth.[87] Even if we do not accept all particulars in these statements as true, yet they prove that Kumārapāla's edifices were not confined to only Aṇhilvāḍ and Devapattana. The modern tradition has also preserved reminiscences of the same. On the Śatruñjaya and the Girnār there are still exhibited Kumāravihāras which, however, have been much restored and contain none of the old inscriptions. In Cambay and Dhandhūka they believe they know at least the sites where Kumārapāla's edifices once stood.

Despite these extensive activities in the service of the Jaina-doctrine and to the advantage of the Jainas, Kumārapāla did not completely forget the old cult of his family. In the *Dvyāś'raya*, Hemacandra himself states about the restoration of the temple of Śivakedāranātha and of the Śiva-Somanātha following the proclamation of the law of Protection, and also about the building of a Kumāreśvara in Aṇhilvāḍ, which took place at a still later time, after the construction of the Kumāravihāras in Aṇhilvāḍ and in Devapattana. The reasons behind the erection of the Kumāreśvara are very peculiar. Mahādeva, says Hemacandra, appeared himself to Kumārapāla in a dream, announced to him that he was satisfied with his services and expressed his desire to reside in Aṇhilvāḍ. From these facts one can conclude that Kumārapāla, despite all his devotion to Hemacandra and despite his adoption of the Jaina faith, never totally denied help to the Śivaites. He might have forced them to give up their bloody sacrifices but he permitted the temple-priests and the ascetics to draw their allowances from the royal treasury. There must have been times when he again drew nearer to the Śivaite faith and worshipped Śiva as well as Jina. Such wavering and such mixing of faiths is not unusual in India and such things have happened in old times to other kings also, who had attached themselves to heterodox sects, as, for example, Harṣavardhana, the well-known king of Thanesar and Kanoj. This latter king had paid his respects, as Hiuen Tsiang states to have observed with his very eyes, to the Buddhists, to the Brāhmins and to the Jainas. The causes of these phenomena are sufficiently clear. At the court there were always, besides the heterodox parties, the orthodox ones whose influence over the princes remained very powerful. Certainly this must have been the case with Aṇhilvāḍ, for according to the *Prabandhas*, the Jaina Vāgbhaṭa was in no way the only minister of Kumārapāla. Along with him there also was a Mantrin, Kapardin, who is not said to have been a Jaina. In the same way, there appears to have been a Śaiva teacher, Devabodhi by name, who is supposed to have been a spiritual adviser to Kumārapāla (see pp. 39, 51) even after his conversion. In the colophon of a manuscript of V. S. 1218 it is mentioned that Mahāmātya Yaśodhavala was the first minister, probably the same-named Parmāra-Prince of Candrāvatī, appointed by Kumārapāla himself.[88] The influence of the orthodox party was naturally strengthened by the old habits of the king and his earlier association with Śivaite ascetics. Added to this, finally, is the tendency of Indian character, that of reconciling sharp contradictions in the religious systems by conceiving and explaining

the same merely as various forms of the same fundamental truth. It has been shown above that in the twelfth century the Brahmanical gods of Trimūrti were identified with the Jinas and that probably Hemacandra himself made use of such an identification in the beginning of his attempts at Kumārapāla's conversion to his doctrine. It was then quite natural that his convert afterwards worshipped Śiva along with Jina. We may perhaps also assume that Hemacandra fully concurred in that, for otherwise he could have hardly recorded so impartially the Śivaite temples built by his patron and pupil. However that might have been, Hemacandra would not have offered any serious opposition to Kumārapāla's Śivaite tendencies and, in order not to jeopardise all his work, he might have connived at it, rather like a clever missionary. These assumptions are strengthened by the fact that Kumārapāla is said to have been a Śivaite in the above-mentioned inscription in Devapattana in honour of Bhāva-Bṛhaspati, which was written in Valabhī-Saṁvat 850 or Vikrama-Saṁvat 1225, only 4 years after his death. Naturally there is in it no talk of the conversion of the king to Jainism. On the contrary, grants are described which he made to Bṛhaspati and other Śaivas and he is further called *Māhes'varanṛpāgraṇīḥ*, "the leader of the kings of the Śaiva faith", in line 50. Then there were indeed cases, which gave an opportunity to the Śaiva-priests to court him as one belonging to their fold, just as there were facts which allowed the Jainas to give him a by-name *Paramārhata*. A perfectly complete victory Hemacandra could not therefore attain, but he certainly succeeded as much as any other heterodox teacher has done with a royal proselyte. It is true that he could not wholly lure Kumārapāla away from Śaivism. But he succeeded in inducing him to constantly observe the most important Jaina-vows, and in exerting a great influence over the government. Gujarat did not, of course, become a Jaina-Empire in the sense that the majority of its population were converted to Jainism. A very significant spread of Jainism was already precluded by the fact that the dogmas of this faith forbade many of the most useful occupations, e. g. agriculture. But the edicts against the killing of animals, against spirituous drink, and against betting and playing at stakes were successfully enforced and thus some of the most important tenets of Jainism came to be rooted into the life of every one.

CHAPTER VIII

Hemacandra's literary works after Kumārapāla's Conversion

Even during the period of his greatest power, when the friendship with Kumārapāla claimed much of him, Hemacandra remained true to his literary aspirations. Besides the *Yogas'āstra*, already mentioned, and an exhaustive commentary thereon, he wrote, between V. S. 1216 and 1229, a collection of stories of the holy, already mentioned, entitled, *Triṣaṣṭis'alākāpuruṣacarita*–"the Life of the sixty-three best men." The work gives in ten *Parvans* the legends of the twenty-four Jinas, the twelve Cakravartins or emperors of India, the nine Vāsudevas, the nine Baladevas and the nine Viṣṇudviṣ or enemies of the nine incarnations of Viṣṇu. An appendix, the *Paris'iṣṭaparvan* or *Sthavirāvalicarita*, deals with the story of Daśapūrvins, the oldest teachers of the Jaina-religion from Jambūsvāmin upto Vajrasvāmin, who still knew the old canonical manuals, called the *Pūrva*. The work is written almost wholly in heroic metre and is called by the author a *Mahākāvya* or great epic. Its extent is very great, so great that it justifies in a certain degree its proud claim of comparison with the *Mahābhārata*, as hinted by the division into *Parvans*. According to Jinamaṇḍana, it contains 36,000 Anuṣṭubh ślokas.[34] Its composition falls later than that of the *Yogas'āstra*, for it is not quoted in the Commentary on the latter. On the other hand, in the notes on **III, 131** the story of the teacher Sthūlabhadra is related in almost identical terms as in the *Paris'iṣṭaparvan* VIII, 2-197 and IX, 55-111a. Only the introductory verses are different and here and there some different readings are found which, however, seldom make any difference in sense. It is therefore evident that the particular passages from the commentary on the *Yogas'āstra* have been taken over in the *Paris'iṣṭaparvan*. On the other hand, the *Triṣaṣṭis'alākāpuruṣacarita* was written earlier than the *Dvyās'rayakāvya* or, at least, earlier than the last five *sargas* of the latter, if we believe Merutuṅga's statement that this poem originally glorified only the victories of Jayasiṁha-Siddharāja, and if we accept that the concluding portion was a later addition (p. 19). The *Dvyās'rayakāvya* describes the story of Kumārapāla a little further than does the *Mahāvīracarita*. For, it mentions, as already shown on p. 33, the magnificent temple of Pārśvanātha at Devapattana. The *Mahāvīracarita* is silent as to this one but it describes in minute details the circumstances which caused the somewhat earlier building of the Kumāravihāra in Aṇhilvāḍ. Further, the Sanskrit *Dvyās'raya* was followed by

the Prakrit *Dvyās'raya* or *Kumaravālacariya*, a very small work entirely dedicated to Kumārapāla and highly praising his piety and devotion to the Jina but at the same time illustrating the rules of the Prakrit-Grammar.[90] The commentary on the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* was probably the last of the scholarly works of this last period. The fact that in this commentary both the *Yogas'āstra* and the *Triṣaṣṭis'alākāpuruṣacarita* are cited, proves not only that it belongs to the period after V. S. 1216 but also that it was written during the last years of the author's life. That this was his last work is also proved by another fact. Closely related with the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*, the Lexicon of Synonyms, is the *Anekārthakoṣa*, that of the Homonyms, which supplements the former.[91] Besides, there also exists a commentary on this, the *Anekārthakairavākarakaumudī*. This is, however, not the work of Hemacandra himself, but of his pupil Mahendra who wrote it in his master's name after the death of the latter. It is said in the *Pras'asti* given at the end of this work:[92]

(1) "By the renowned Mahendrasūri, the ever truly devoted pupil of the renowned Hemasūri, is this commentary written in the name of his (master)."

(2) "Where is to be found in an unlucky fellow like me such skill in exposition (as is required) for the book of the well-known master Hemacandra, one with the treasures of perfection (*samyaktva*) and knowledge, endowed with endless advantages? If, nevertheless, I have expounded it, it is no wonder; for I repeat the (oral) explanations of him (that man) who lives constantly in may heart."

The concluding words indicate that at the time when Mahendra wrote, Hemacandra was dead and that Mahendra, out of piety for the deceased, wrote down his oral explanations and published them in his name. It also appears that Hemacandra might have thought of himself commenting on the second part of his *Koṣa*, but before he could carry out his plan, he was overpowered by death. It may therefore be supposed that the commentary on the first part was completed just before the death. It is to be repeated that (see page 37) also the *S'eṣākhyā Nāmamālā* can possibly belong to this last period, if this work was originally included in the commentary on the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*. This statement may be corroborated by similar occurrences in the commentary on the *Yogas'āstra* which contains metrical supplements to the text (Note 80). Certainty about this point can, however, be arrived at only if the old palm-leaf MSS. of the commentary on the *Koṣa* be carefully investigated. As regards the date of the work about Jaina dialectics mentioned as *Pramāṇamimāṁsā* in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, but as *Syādvādamañjarī* in the MSS.,[93] I can say nothing definite. As, however, it is not mentioned in the commentary on the *Yogas'āstra*, it also belongs, perhaps, to the works of the period of V. S. 1216-1229. With this, the list of Hemacandra's works is exhausted. The author of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* says, in fact, "simple-minded people like him" (Note 74) do not know all the works of the great master, and Rājaśekhara boldly believes that Hemacandra wrote 30,000,000 ślokas. Though this statement is often repeated in the *Paṭṭāvalis* or *Gurvāvalis*, it is obviously an absurd exaggeration. As yet there has been found no reason to ascribe more books to Hemacandra than the ones mentioned here, and these contain about 100,000 ślokas. In this respect, it is particularly important to

remember that even a thorough examination into the old libraries of Cambay, Jesalmir and Aṇhilvāḍ has not as yet given rise to a claim of any more books than those mentioned in the list of the *Prabhāvakacaritra*.

Hemacandra's educational work seems to have been no less extended than his literary activities. His oldest and most prominent pupil was the above-mentioned (p. 19) one-eyed Rāmacandra. The *Prabandhas* state about him that he had written one hundred works. Recently two dramas by this man have been discovered, viz. *Raghuvilāpa*, and *Nirbhayabhīma*. In the signature to the latter drama, Rāmacandra qualifies himself as a *s'ataprabandhakartṛ*, "author of hundred works". Besides him, the *Prabandhas* name at various places Guṇacandra, Yaśascandra, Bālacandra and Udayacandra, the last of whom is also mentioned in the Colophon of the Commentary on the *Bṛhadvṛtti* of the Grammar (Note 34). The *Pras'asti* of the Commentary on the *Anekārthakoṣa* proves, as has been already shown, the existence of a sixth pupil, Mahendra by name, and the *Kumāravihārapras'asti* informs us of a seventh one, named Vardhamānagaṇin. The modern tradition is naturally not satisfied with such a modest number. Even at present they exhibit in Aṇhilvāḍ a stone, stained with ink, upon which Hemacandra's *āsana* is supposed to have been placed. One hundred pupils, so say the Jainas, surrounded him daily and wrote down the works which their *Guru* dictated to them.

CHAPTER IX

Stories about the intercourse between Hemacandra and Kumārapāla, and about their end

Besides the details, already mentioned, about Hemacandra's activity after Kumārapāla's conversion, the *Prabandhas* contain still many more stories which describe his intercourse with the king and a few other events. Although most of these anecdotes are historically worthless, they may however be briefly quoted for the sake of the completeness of our work. As may be expected, their number is the smallest in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*. This work gives only five. Merutuṅga, on the other hand, gives sixteen. To them Rājaśekhara adds a few more. Jinamaṇḍana offers, again, something more and gives more artistic recensions by others, in which the old material is worked up in a better way. According to their contents, they divide themselves into two main groups, viz., (1) those that magnify Hemacandra's knowledge and character, and (2) those that prove Kumārapāla's devotion to his teacher and affection for Jainism.

As regards Hemacandra, first of all, a large number of verses is cited which he is supposed to have composed on various occasions. Merutuṅga makes him sing Kumārapāla's praise when the latter gave up the confiscation of the property of the childless merchant. His statement, however, does not agree with that of the *Prabhāvakacaritra*. In this latter work, it is assumed that the verse, which Merutuṅga ascribes to the "Scholar", belongs to Hemacandra, while the one declared by Merutuṅga as Hemacandra's composition, does not at all occur. Then, Merutuṅga quotes a *s'loka*, which praises Āmrabhaṭa, the second son of his patron Udayana, on account of his completing the temple of Suvrata in Broach, as well as a song in praise of this Tīrthaṁkara. In this case the *Prabhāvakacaritra* also has the first verse. Besides, in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* there occurs still a Prakrit-*Daṇḍaka* which Hemacandra is supposed to have composed in Śatruñjaya, and an Apabhraṁśa-hemistich, the contents of which are not proper for a monk as they refer to a dancing girl. Jinamaṇḍana has a much greater number, most of which may be found in his report of Kumārapāla's fulfilment of the twelve Jaina vows.[95]

More interesting than these probably throughout apocryphal proofs of Hemacandra's dexterity in poetry, is a legend which is to show how cleverly he treated the Brāhmin priests who wanted to compel the king to break his vow. Rājaśekhara, who is the earliest to tell us this legend, describes it as follows: "A short time after Kumārapāla had enforced the protection of living animals, there began the bright half of the month Āśvina. Thereupon, the priests of Kunteśvarī and of other goddesses proclaimed to the king: 'Lord, on the seventh day the king must, according to the custom of his ancestors, offer to the goddesses seven hundred goats and seven buffalos. On the eighth day eight hundred goats and eight buffalos and on the ninth day nine hundred goats and nine buffalos.' After the king had heard that, he went to Hemacandra and informed him of the matter. The great teacher whispered something in his ears. The king then arose and promised to pay the priests what was their due. By night the animals were led into the temple of the goddess, the doors were carefully locked and trustworthy Rajputs were posted as guards. The next morning, the king arrived and ordered to open the doors of the temple. In the middle they saw the animals lying down and chewing the cud, refreshed by the repose in the wind-sheltered place. Thereupon said the king: 'Priests, these animals I had offered to the goddesses. If they had any liking for the animals, they could have consumed them. The animals, however, are quite safe. Apparently, therefore, the goddesses have no liking for flesh. But *you* love it. Hence keep absolute quiet. I will not permit the killing of living animals.' The Priests hung their heads down. The goats were released. The king, however, had the food-offering brought to the goddesses, worth the value of the goats."

The story, which Jinamaṇḍana relates in a slightly shorter form, reminds us in a certain way of the Biblical story of Elijas and the priests of Baal. However, one can hardly take it as an adaptation of the latter. It probably arose independently. Even if this story be an invention, it is certainly a good invention in as much as it properly describes the difficulties, which Kumārapāla had to face upon his conversion, and the methods of his spiritual counsel to remove them from his path. It is noteworthy that according to this legend the cult of Kunteśvarī was not abolished but was transformed from a bloody to a bloodless cult.

Two other stories by Merutuṅga show how Hemacandra behaved towards his enemies. The first one tells us that the mighty Śiva-priest Bṛhaspati once occasioned some inconvenience regarding the Kumāravihāra in Devapattana. Immediately he lost his job because of Hemacandra's disfavour. Thereupon he came to Aṇhilvāḍ, learnt the *Ṣoḍhās'vayaka* and served the Jaina-monk. An entreaty-verse pacified the latter at last and Bṛhaspati was again appointed as the guardian of the Śaiva-foundations. Just as harsh, but also equally as forgiving, Hemacandra showed himself towards an old enemy, Vāmadeva or Vāmarāśi, who had been his rival during Jayasiṁha's reign and who chaffed at him with a malicious satirical verse when Hemacandra gained his high position. As a punishment he opprobriously ordered his servants to drive Vāmarāśi out of his house with their lance-shafts. He also sentenced him to the *as'astra-vadha*, "the punishment of a bloodless death," which consisted of the withdrawal of his *vṛtti*, his salary from the royal treasury. Vāmarāśi then subsisted on scattered grains which he gleaned, and stood often

before the school of his enemy. As Ānā and other princes were one day learning the *Yogaśāstra* there, Vāmarāśi praised this work in a verse "in all sincerity." Hemacandra was therefore reconciled and granted him a *vṛtti*, double as large as the earlier one had been.[97] The story about Bṛhaspati probably presents the relationship of this man to Hemacandra in a more proper light than the legend, given above (p. 29), according to which the Śaiva monk and the Jaina monk were good friends.

By far the greatest number of the legends given in the *Prabandhas* describes, however, Hemacandra's supernatural powers, his gift of prophecy, his knowledge of the remotest past, his hold over evil spirits and the Brahmanic deities hostile to Jainism. Already in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, a prophecy of Hemacandra's is mentioned, which was literally fulfilled. The king of Kalyāṇa-kaṭaka, it is said, who had received information from his spies that Kumārapāla had become a Jaina and was therefore powerless, gathered a big army with a view to conquering Gujarat. Full of anxiety, Kumārapāla went to Hemacandra and inquired whether he would be defeated by this enemy. Hemacandra consoled him by saying that the protecting deities of the Jaina-doctrine were keeping watch over Gujarat, and that the enemy would die on the seventh day. In reality, the spies brought Kumārapāla soon afterwards the news that the prophecy had come true. Both Merutuṅga and Jinamaṇḍana also have this story. In their version the hostile king is, however, Karṇa, the ruler of Dāhala or Tivar in the Central Provinces. They also state how he died, and describe that he was asleep on his elephant during a nocturnal march, when his golden necklace got caught in a banyan tree, and he was strangled to death. Karṇa of Dāhala ruled about hundred years before Kumārapāla and was, as Merutuṅga rightly points out elsewhere, a contemporary of Bhīmadeva I.[98]

A second proof of his prophetic gift, according to Merutuṅga, Hemacandra furnished when he described his story of a previous birth to the king. Rājaśekhara and Jinamaṇḍana give the same *in extenso* and add thereto that Hemacandra himself did not describe it but that he made Vidyādevīs reveal themselves in Siddhapura for the purpose. The king came to know thereby the cause of his enmity with Jayasiṁha and was, as Jinamaṇḍana says, so very much surprised at the wisdom of his teacher that he conferred upon him the title of *Kalikālasarvajña*, "the omniscient of the *Kali-yuga*."[99] It is not at all improbable that Hemacandra claimed to have told the king about his fate in the previous life, as the Jaina-monks have often done so in similar circumstances. It is another question whether the version before us really reflects the *Pūrvavṛttānta* described by Hemacandra.

Absolutely absurd but characteristic of the gradual development of the legends is the third story related by Jinamaṇḍana, attributing to Hemacandra the gift of clairvoyance. Once, so the story goes, Hemacandra was sitting with the king and the Śaiva-ascetic Devabodhi and was explaining the holy scriptures. Suddenly he stopped and screamed a cry of woe. Devabodhi rubbed his hands and said: "That does not matter a bit!" Then the devotional lesson was resumed. When Hemacandra had finished it, Kumārapāla asked him what had been the matter with him and Devabodhi. Thereupon the monk replied: "O King, I saw that in the temple of Candraprabha in Devapattana

a rat dragged away the wick of a lamp and consequently a conflagration broke out. Devabodhi extinguished it when he rubbed his hands." Kumārapāla sent, thereupon, messengers to Devapattana and found that Hemacandra's statement had been correct.[100]

The *Prabhāvakacaritra* also supplies us with an instance of Hemacandra's magic powers. It relates, that Āmrabhaṭa came into conflict with Saindhavī Devī and Yoginīs as he had the Temple of Suvrata in Broach restored. He was consequently punished with illness by them. His mother invoked the help of Hemacandra who went to Broach with his pupil Yaśaścandra, made the Devī surrender by magic powers, and healed Āmrabhaṭa. Slightly different recensions of this anecdote are found in Merutuṅga and in Jinamaṇḍana.[101]

Both these latter as well as Rājaśekhara also relate that Hemacandra cured Kumārapāla of leprosy. According to Merutuṅga, this disease attacked the king as a result of a curse which the pious mother of the king Lakṣa of Kach had given to the successors of Mūlarāja, the conqueror of her son. By the power of his *Yoga*, Hemacandra cured the king. According to Rājaśekhara, Kunteśvari Devī, the family goddess of the Caulukyas, took revenge for the prohibition of her sacrifices (p. 52) by revealing herself to Kumārapāla and striking him on the head with the trident. As a result, he became leprous. He called his minister Udayana to him and told him his tale of woe. On Udayana's advice, Hemacandra was requested to help, who cured the disease with the water consecrated with magical incantations. Jinamaṇḍana gives enlarged recensions of both the stories and makes the miracle doubly worked.[102]

Still more phantastic are the two stories which are related by Jinamaṇḍana alone. The first of them is: Kumārapāla had taken a pledge not to quit his capital during the rainy season, in order to fulfil the sixth vow of the Jainas. Meanwhile, he received information from his spies that the Śaka Prince of Garjana, that is, the Muhammedan Sultan of Gazni, had made preparations to wage a war against Gujarat precisely during that rainy season. Kumārapāla was greatly perplexed. If he wanted to keep his vow, he could not defend his land. If, on the other hand, he would fulfil his royal obligations, he must become untrue to the Jaina faith. In this dilemma he approached Hemacandra who reassured him at once and promised help. Hemacandra then sat down in the posture of 'lotus-seat' (*padmāsana*) and gave himself up into deep meditation. After a while, there came a palanquin flying through the air, in which lay a sleeping man. This sleeper was the Prince of Garjana whom Hemacandra had dragged in there by the power of his *Yoga*-magic. He was released only after he had promised to preserve peace with Gujarat and to command in his kingdom the protection of all living beings during six months. The second story ascribes a still greater power to Hemacandra. Once he had a quarrel with Devabodhi as to whether it was a full-moon day or a new-moon day. He himself had voted for the former which was, however, wrong; he was therefore scoffed at by Devabodhi. Despite this, Hemacandra declared that he had not been wrong but asserted that the evening would prove the correctness of his view. When the sun set in, Kumārapāla with Devabodhi and his barons climbed on the top-room of his palace in order to see if the moon would rise and as a matter of precaution he also sent messengers

to the east on a swift dromedary. The full moon *did* really rise in the east, shone forth the whole night and the next morning set in the west! The royal messengers who had ridden far into the land, told the same story on their return. It was therefore no illusion that might have deceived the king's eyes, but a real miracle that Hemacandra worked with the help of a ministering godling who had given him a *siddhacakra.*[103]

The number of the legends of the second group is much smaller and almost all of them are met with already in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*. The first story, which is to show the attachment of the king to Hemacandra, relates about an amazing transformation of the ordinary palm trees of the royal garden into Śrītāla-trees. Once, it has been said, on account of copying the numerous works of Hemacandra, the palm-leaves were exhausted and there was no hope of getting a new stock imported from abroad. Kumārapāla was very much distressed at the thought of his teacher's work being interrupted. He went into his garden where many ordinary palm trees stood, worshipped them with fragrant substances and flowers, placed round their trunks golden wreaths adorned with pearls and rubies and prayed that they might be transformed into Śrītāla-trees. The next morning the gardeners announced that the king's wish had been fulfilled. The messengers who brought the happy news were richly rewarded, and the scribes worked further with greater zeal. This fable is quite similarly related by Jinamaṇḍana. He only commits an anachronism when he assumes that the scribes would have managed with paper which, however, the king did not think proper. As the close scrutiny of the old Jaina-Libraries has brought out, the use of paper was only introduced to Gujarat one hundred and twenty years later after the conquest of the land by the Muhammadans.[104]

A second and still greater proof of his devotion was furnished by Kumārapāla to his teacher by presenting his empire to Hemacandra. According to the *Prabhāvakacaritra* this happened on the occasion of explaining a Gāthā which makes complete surrender a duty to the believer. Hemacandra refused, it is said, to accept the gift by arguing that as an ascetic he must be free from all possessions and from all desires. In spite of it, the king did not want to give in. Thereupon the minister intervened and proposed that Kumārapāla should remain the king but should fulfil the royal duties only with the approval of his *Guru*. The solution was accepted and Hemacandra wrote the *Yogaśāstra* with a view to instructing Kumārapāla as to how he should, as a believing king, behave himself.[105]

Very many particular but probably apocryphal accounts about Kumārapāla's manifestations of his faith in the Jina are given by Jinamaṇḍana. There, he relates that the king had, after his conversion, given away to the Brāhmins all the images of Maheśvara and other gods which his forefathers had worshipped, and that he only tolerated the statues of the Jinas in his palace.[106] Moreover, in his long report of the taking of the twelve vows in the presence of Hemacandra, he describes in detail how the king fulfilled each of them and what *Birudas* or 'titles of honour' he received for the same. Amongst the laws, which the observance of the Jaina precepts is said to have caused, the following deserve special mention. In order to fulfil the seventh vow, which forbids unnecessary force and occupations connected therewith, the king renounced the

revenues which he received from charcoal-burning, from the forest, from the tax on bullock-carts kept for hire etc., and he ordered to destroy the register about these things. The contents of the twelfth vow made him remit taxes to the amount of 12 lacs which the "faithful" (*s'rāddhas*) paid. For the same reason, he granted money to needy Jainas and had houses (*sattrāgāras*) built where food was distributed to beggars. As regards his title of honour, Hemacandra called him *S'araṇāgatatrātā*, "Protector of the supplicants for help", for his fulfilment of the first vow, *Yudhiṣṭhira* for the fulfilment of the second, and *Brahmarṣi* for that of the fourth.[107]

Moreover, we find in all the *Prabandhas* the statement that Kumārapāla undertook one or several pilgrimages to the Jaina shrines of Gujarat in company with Hemacandra. According to the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, only one took place quite at the end of his reign. On this one pilgrimage he visited Śatruñjaya and Girnar. He did not, however, mount the latter hill himself, but worshipped Neminātha at the foot of it. He commissioned his minister Vāgbhaṭa to construct a better road up the rock. Merutuṅga's *Tīrthayātrāprabandha* gives a very similar account. It connects with it, however, the anecdote of the planned attack by the king Dāhala, and makes Kumārapāla, as the leader of the Jaina congregation (*Saṁghādhipati*), enter Śatruñjaya via Dhandhuka. In the first-named city, so it is said, the "Cradle-vihāra" (p. 46) was built on this occasion. Merutuṅga also appears to place the pilgrimage at the end of Kumārapāla's reign. Rājaśekhara, on the other hand, speaks of two pilgrimages: one to Kāṭhiāvāḍ and the other to Stambhapura or Cambay, which latter city the king is said to have presented to Jina Pārśvanātha. Finally, Jinamaṇḍana agrees with Merutuṅga, but declares in his general survey of Kumārapāla's work that the king consecrated himself by seven pilgrimages, and that on the occasion of the first one, he worshipped the Jina with nine jewels which were worth nine lacs.[108] Now, even if there be no confirmation of these statements in documents of Kumārapāla's time, one may nevertheless believe the *Prabandhas* when they say that the king actually visited Śatruñjaya and Girnar towards the end of his reign. The silence of the *Dvyās'rayakāvya* and of the *Mahāvīracarita* on this point has no great significance, for both these works were composed, as shown above, some time before the end of Kumārapāla's reign. On the other hand, the rare, complete agreement of both the oldest *Prabandhas* is a weighty argument in favour of the general correctness of their statement, and a still more weighty one for the internal probability of the same. It is precisely in their last years that the Indian princes make pilgrimages their habit and it is easy to understand that Kumārapāla, who had himself built shrines in various localities of the peninsula of Kāṭhiāvāḍ, felt it incumbent on him to pay a visit to them. On the contrary, it is extremely questionable whether the details of this pilgrimage are correctly described. For, one can hardly believe that if Kumārapāla visited Girnar, he should have left unvisited Devapattana which is not very far from Girnar and where his temples of Pārśvanātha and Somanātha stood. The statements about his visit to Cambay and about the seven pilgrimages can have, of course, little claim to be credible as they are to be found only in later works.

As to Hemacandra's end, the *Prabhāvakacaritra* gives no details. It only says that he died in Vikrama-Saṁvat 1229. Merutuṅga gives some more details.

According to his account, Hemacandra predicted that he would die at the end of his 84th year, and when he had reached that age, he began the last fast, customary among the Jaina ceremonies, which leads the monk surely to Nirvāṇa. Before his death, he prophesied to his friend, who was lamenting for him, that he (his friend) too would meet his end after six months, and admonished him, being childless, to perform the last rites for himself whilst he was still alive. After he had spoken thus, "he released the breath of life through the tenth opening of the body." Kumārapāla had his corpse burned and, as he considered the ashes as sacred, made a sign on his forehead with the same. All the nobles of the kingdom and the citizens of Aṇhilvāḍ followed his example. Merutuṅga adds that even now the Hemakhaṇḍa at Aṇhilvāḍ is famous for that reason. It is further said that Kumārapāla passed the rest of his life in deep sorrow and after a reign of 31 years died, on the predicted day, "the death of Meditation." The latter form of expression appears to indicate that he, too, chose, by fast, the death of the wise man.

Jinamaṇḍana repeats Merutuṅga's account in so far as it concerns Hemacandra; but he adds a few details as regards his last years. He states that these were embittered by a schism amongst his pupils. Kumārapāla, being childless and an aged man, was distressed as to the selection of a successor and was in doubt whether to appoint Ajayapāla, his brother's son who had the first claim according to the custom, or the son of his daughter, Pratāpamalla, as his heir. Hemacandra had declared himself in favour of the latter, for he was beloved by the people and firm in faith, whereas Ajayapāla was inclined to evil passions, favoured the Brahmins and would surely put aside the laws made by his uncle. Inspite of this, Bālacandra is said to have formed an intimate friendship with Ajayapāla against the wish of his teacher and against the interests of his faith. Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra, on the other hand, remained true to their teacher. Jinamaṇḍana describes Kumārapāla's end somewhat differently from Merutuṅga. According to his account, Kumārapāla was poisoned by Ajayapāla after the former had chosen Pratāpamalla as his successor, following Hemacandra's advice. When Kumālapāla felt the effect of the poison, he sent for a shell in his treasury, which could chase away poison. Ajayapāla had already had this removed. When the king heard this, he prepared for death according to Jaina rites and died, after having vowed to decline all food. Ajayapāla then ascended the throne, being supported by the Brahmin party.[109]

From these accounts we can take with certainty only this much that Hemacandra died in V. S. 1229 shortly before Kumārapāla. The assertion that during the last years of his life he became involved in the intrigues regarding the successor to the throne and that he attempted to exclude the rightful heir in the interests of the Jaina faith is, *ipso facto*, not improbable. In favour of this assertion, it may be argued that, according to all the sources there was a strong reaction against Jainism after his death, and that Hemacandra's and Kumārapāla's old friends, Rāmacandra and Āmrabhaṭa (Udayana's son) were particularly persecuted by the new king. Similarly, the story of Pratāpamalla's being selected as successor to the throne and of Kumārapāla's being poisoned is by no means incredible. However, before we declare it to be historical with any certainty, it will be necessary to have the story confirmed by older and more reliable sources than Jinamaṇḍana's compilation.

8

NOTES

1. The life of Hemacandra forms the XXII and last *S'ṛṅga* of the *Pūrvarṣicaritrarohaṇagiri* or *Prabhāvakacaritra*, and a few notes about him also occur in the XXI *S'ṛṅga*. This work, a continuation of Hemacandra's *Paris'iṣṭaparvan* to the *Triṣaṣṭis'alākāpuruṣacaritra*, was compiled by Prabhācandrasūri, Candraprabha's successor, and was corrected by Pradyumnasūri, the pupil of Kanakaprabhasūri, who on his part was a pupil of the grammarian Devānanda. Verse 16 of the Introduction is as follows:

श्रीदेवानन्दशैक्षश्रीकनकप्रभशिष्यराट् ।
श्रीप्रद्युम्नप्रभुर्जीयाद्ग्रन्थस्यास्य विशुद्धिकृत् ॥

"Victory to the lord S'rī Pradyumna who completely purified this work (from errors)—he, the king among the pupils of S'rī Kanakaprabha, the pupil of S'rī Devānanda!"

Quite the same has been said in the verses which stand at the end of each of the *S'ṛṅgas*. At the end of the XXII *S'ṛṅga*, the following verse occurs:

श्रीचंद्रप्रभसूरिपट्टसरसीहंसप्रभः श्रीप्रभा-
चंद्रः सूरिरनेन चेतसि कृते श्रीरामलक्ष्मीभुवा ।
श्रीपूर्वर्षिचरित्ररोहणगिरौ श्रीहेमचंद्रः प्राधा[श्रीहेमचंद्रप्रभोः]
श्रीप्रद्युम्नमुनींदुना विशदितः श्रृंगो द्विकद्विप्रम[ः] ॥

"On the throne of S'rī-Candraprabhasūri (there sits), like a swan in a lake, Sūri Prabhācandra. In the biography of the well-known *Ṛṣis* of old—a biography which is comparable to the Rohaṇa mountain—concieved by this (Prabhācandra) son of S'rī Rāma and Lakṣmī, (thus ends) the twenty second peak (*S'ṛṅga*) in the form of biographical sketch of S'rī Hemacandra, which is purified by S'rī-Pradyumna, the moon among the monks."

Several other verses, too, at the end of *S'ṛṅgas* I, V, VII, XI, XIII, XV, XVII, XIX and XXI are dedicated to the praise of Pradyumna. The third from the last of these is important, as it contains a statement which enables us to determine Pradyumna's time at least approximately. This verse says:

श्रीदेवानंदसूरिर्दिशतु मुदमसौ लक्षणाद्येन हैमा-
दुद्धृत्याभ्यासहेतोर्विहितमभिनवं सिद्धसारस्वताख्य[म्] ।

शाब्दं शाब्दं यदीयान्वयिकनकगिरिस्थानकल्पद्रुमश्च
श्रीमान्प्रद्युम्नसूरिर्विशदयति गिरं नः पदार्थं प्रदाता ॥

"May joy be caused to you by Sūri S'rī Devānanda, through whom, for the sake of the ignorant, a new grammar, called Siddha-Sārasvata, was written—taken from the manual of Hemacandra —and by the successor of his pupil Kanakaprabha, namely S'rī Pradyumnasūri, whom we may compare to a tree of paradise; he, the purifier of word-forms and of the meaning, purifies our speech".

From this verse, of the second half of which I have merely given the general sense, without paying attention to the play of words, we see that Devānanda wrote a manual of grammar entitled *Siddha-Sārasvata*, which was an extract from Hemacandra's works. As Hemacandra calls his grammar *Siddha-Hemacandra*, and as this title means "the manual written by Hemacandra in honour of King Jayasimha-Siddharāja", it seems obvious that we may interpret the name of Devānanda's work in a similar way, and explain it by "the Sārasvata (i. e. the work completed by the grace of the goddess Sarasvatī) written in honour of King Siddharāja". If this explanation be correct,—for we must confess that another explanation is by all means possible,–then Devānanda would have been a contemporary of Hemacandra's and would have written under Jayasimha-Siddharāja (who died Vikrama-Samvat 1199, Kārttika sudi 3 or 1142/2 A. D.). In that case the literary activity of Pradyumna Sūri, the pupil of his pupil, would fall within the first and second half of the 13th Century, approximately. However, we are saved from the necessity of building upon so uncertain a foundation, by some very interesting informations from the *Pras'astis* of the Cambay-manuscript of Bālacandra's *Vivekamañjarīṭīkā* in Dr. Peterson's *Third Report*, App. I, pp. 101-109, which gives a quite certain date for the activity of the above-named Pradyumnasūri. The first *Pras'asti* (*l. c.* pp. 101-103), a song in praise of the author of the *Vivekamañjarī* and of the author of the Commentary, relates the following: The poet Āsaḍa, born of the Bhillamālavams'a (i. e. a S'rīmālā Vāṇiā) and a son of Kaṭuka-rāja, who for his services in expounding Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*, received the title *Kavisabhās'ṛṅgāra*, "the ornament of the assembly of poets", from the court scholars (*rājasabhyāḥ*), had two sons, Rājaḍa-Bālasarasvatī and Jaitrasimha by his wife Jaitalladevī. When the first one died, he mourned deeply. "Awakened" by a Sūri named Abhayadeva, he wrote the *Vivekamañjarī* in V. S. 1268 (Peterson, *First Report*, App. I p. 56) or 1211-12 A. D. (verse 12). His second son Jaitrasimha later induced the Gaṇin Bālacandra to write a commentary on his father's work (verse 13). The latter called in the assistance of three men, namely, Vijayasenasūri from Nagendragaccha, Padmasūri from Bṛhadgaccha (verse 14) and Pradyumnasūri, who was the pupil of Kanakaprabhasūri, "the moon which adorned the heaven of Devānanda's school". We find here the same order: Devānanda, Kanakaprabha and Pradyumna, as in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, and it is therefore certain that the corrector of the last-named was Bālacandra's assistant. The last verse of the 2nd *Pras'asti*, a song in praise of the noble donor of the Cambay MS. (*l. c.* p. 109, verse 38) teaches us that the MS. was completed on the 8th day of the dark half of the month Kārttika, in the year 1322 (of the Vikrama-era) on a Monday, or, according to Dr. Schram's calculation, on the 2nd November 1265, which actually was a Monday. Immediately afterwards there is the announcement that this *Pras'asti* was corrected by the venerable S'rī Pradyumnasūri (*pras'astiḥ samāptā||s'ubham-astu||pūjyas'rī-Pradyumnasūribhiḥ pras'astiḥ sams'odhiteti*). This has gained for us a definite date for Pradyumna's activity. It may be added, moreover, that he also helped with the production of a third work of which we may assert with great probability that it belongs to the middle of the 13th century at the latest. Devāsūri says in the Introduction to his *S'āntināthacarita* (Peterson, *First Report*, 1882-83, p. 60, App. pp. 4-6) that his poem is a revision of a Prakrit work of the same name by Devacandrasūri (verse 13). Then he praises the pupil of the latter, Hemacandra, who converted a king [Kumārapāla] (Verses 14-15). Then (verse 16) he pays his homage to Devānanda, author of the *Siddha-Sārasvata* Grammar, and relates (verse 17) that Pradyumna, prince amongst the pupils of Kanakaprabha, Devānanda's pupil, corrected his work. Verse 17 is so similar to the above-quoted verse of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* XVII, 329, that it is safe to ascribe it to the same author, Pradyumnasūri. The age of the *S'āntinathacarita* is approximately determined by the fact that the Cambay MS. of the

same was written in the Saṁvat, i. e. in all probability Vikrama-Saṁvat 1338 or 1282-83 A. D. The era cannot be determined, in this case, with absolute certainty as no details are available. The fact that the Jainas almost always use the Vikrama-era, is a point in favour of the theory that this era is meant.

These results of the investigation of Pradyumna's period allow us to assert safely that the *Prabhāvakacaritra* belongs to the 13th century, and make it probable that the date of its compilation is not far removed from 1250 A. D. It is therefore the oldest source for the life of Hemacandra. It is all the more essential to emphasize this and to explain it fully, as my honoured friend Rão Bahādur S'. P. Paṇḍit places this work at a much later period. He opines in his Introduction to the Gauḍavaho, p. CXLIX, that it was written after Rājas'ekhara's *Prabandhakoṣa* (see Note 3) and that Rājas'ekhara is mentioned in the *Prabhācaritra*, XI, 1. However, the verse in question, in its correct form, reads:—

बप्पभट्टिः श्रिये श्रीमान्यद्वृत्तगगनाङ्गणे ।
खेलति स्म गतायातै राजेश्वरकविर्बुधः ॥ १ ॥

The MS. which is available to me, which, like No. 12 of the *Deccan College Collection of 1879/80*, was made after the copy in Haṭhisiṅg's Bhaṇḍār at Ahmadabad, and is full of errors, gives *gatāyātaiḥ rājes'varaḥ*. The Deccan College MS. has not these two errors, but then at the end we read instead of *budhaḥ*, the nonsensical reading *budā*, for which R. B. Pandit substitutes *mudā*. This correction is not only unnecessary, but also spoils the sense. The translation of the verse is:–

"(May) the illustrious Bappabhaṭṭi (lead us) to prosperity, in whose life the wise (*budha*) Rājes'varakavi going and coming played (a *rôle*), like the planet Mercury (*budha*) in the firmament".

Rājes'varakavi means the same as Vākpatirāja, and therefore serves to designate the author of the *Gauḍavaha*, who, according to the Jaina-legend, repeatedly came into contact with Bappabhaṭṭi. He is called *budha* (wise), and this word, which is also a name of the planet Mercury, leads to the further comparison of the life of Bappabhaṭṭi with the firmament. The latter is very popular with Jaina poets, and seemed suitable to the author, as he hints that the life of the teacher was pure as the firmament to which, as the Indians say, no dirt adheres. Rão Bahādur Pandit's hypothesis that this verse says that Bappabhaṭṭi's life-story is borrowed from the *Prabandhakoṣa*, is therefore wrong. An exact comparison of the date in the *Prabhāvakacaritra* with those of the *Prabandhakoṣa* would have shown clearly, that the account of the latter is based upon the former. Another argument brought forward by R. B. Pandit for the late date of the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, is just as unsound. He says, *loc. cit.* p. CLIII:-

"The author of this work lived long after Hemacandra (A. D. 1089-1174) because in addition to writing a story of the latter's life in his work he speaks of him as having written *long ago* (*purā* XI. 11) certain works on the lives of some of the men about whom he writes himself".

This expression contains many errors. The passage which R. B. Pandit has in his mind, does not occur in the *Pr. Car.* XI. 11, but in I, 11 in the Introduction to the work. It also does not affirm that the author bases himself upon Hemacandra's works, but that he carries further the life-story of the Jaina-teachers which was begun by Hemacandra in the *Triṣaṣtis'alākāpuruṣacaritra.* There in the *Paris'iṣṭaparvan* the narrative breaks off with the life of Vajrasvāmin. The verses in question read in my MS. as follows:

कलौ युगप्रधानश्रीहेमचंद्रः[द्र]प्रभुः पुरा ।
श्रीशलाकानृणां वृणं [वृत्तं] प्रास्तवीन् नृपबोधकृत् ॥ ११ ॥
श्रुतकेवलिनां षण्णां दशपूर्वभृतामपि ।
भावप्रस्वामिवृत्तं च चरितानि व्यधत्त सः ॥ १२ ॥

ध्याततन्नाममन्त्रस्य प्रसादात् प्राप्तवासनः ।
आरोक्ष्यन्निव हेमाद्रिं पादाभ्यां विश्वहास्यभूः ॥ १३ ॥
श्रीवज्रानुप्रवृत्तानां शासनोन्नतिकारिणाम् ।
प्रभावकमुनीन्द्राणां वृत्तानि कियता[ता]मपि ॥ १४ ॥
बहुश्रुतमुनीशेभ्यः प्राग्र[ग्र]न्थेभ्यश्च कानि[चित्] ।
.........वर्णयिष्ये कियन्त्यपि ॥ १५ ॥ त्रिशेषकम् ॥

The gap in the last verse should probably be filled in by *avagamya yathābuddhi.* Lastly, the expression *purā*, which R. B. Pandit translates by "long ago", merely means "formerly" and is indefinite. It is used just as often for events which do not much precede the time of narration, as for such as took place centuries before.

2. Besides the edition by S'āstrī Rāmacandra Dinanātha, which appeared lately in Bombay, I have two not quite complete MSS. at my disposal, I. O. L. Bühler S. MSS. No. 295 and 296. The last verse, which contains the date, is published in Dr. Peterson's *Second Report*, p. 87. It is to be found exactly the same in No. 296.

3. I have given the date of the *Prabandhakoṣa* or of the *Prabandhacaturviṁs'ati* as in the *Journ. Bo. Br. Roy. As. Soc.* Vol. X, p. 32 Note; cf. also Rāo Bahādur S'. P. Paṇdit, *Gauḍavaho*, p. CXLIII. The MS. which I quote further, is I. O. L. Bühler S. MSS. No. 294. The life of Hemacandra forms the 10th *Prabandha.*

4. The portion at the end of this work reads, in No. 286 of the above-mentioned collection, thus:

प्रबन्धो योजितः श्रीकुमारनृपतेरयम् ।
गद्यपद्यैर्नवै[:] कैश्चित् प्राप्त[क्त]ननिर्मितैः ॥
श्रीसोमसुन्दरगुरोः शिष्येण यथाश्रुतानुसारेण ।
श्रीजिनमण्डनगणिना द्व्यङ्कमनु १४९२ प्रमितवत्सरे रुचिरः ॥

इति श्रीसोमसुन्दरशा[सू]रीश्वरश्रीजिनमण्डनोपाध्यायैः श्रीकुमारपाल[प्रबन्धो] दृष्टश्रुतानुसारेण योजि[तः] ग्रन्थाग्रं ४२०० इति श्रीकुमारपालचरित्रं संपूर्णम् ॥

The first verse seems to be a mutilated Anuṣṭubh. In the first half we might read *s'rimat-Kumāra*, and in the second half *prāktananirmitair api.* The date of the work was already correctly given by Col. Tod, *Travels in Western India*, p. 192, but the author was there erroneously called Sailug Acharj.

5. The following passage is found on page 99, line 9, of the above-mentioned MS:—

तेन यथा सिद्धराजो रञ्जितो व्याकरणं कृतं वादिनो जिताः । यथा च कुमारपालेन सह प्रतिपन्नं कुमारपालोऽपि यथा पञ्चाशद्वर्षदेशीयो निषणीयो[भिषिक्तो ?]यथा श्रीहेमसूरयो गुरुत्वेन प्रतिपन्नाः । तैरपि यथा देवबोधिः प्रतिपक्षः पराकृतः । राजा सम्यक्त्वं ग्राहितः श्रावकः कृतः । निर्वीराधनं च मुमोच सः । तत् प्रबन्धचिन्तामणितो ज्ञेयम् । किं चर्वितचर्वणेन । नवीना-[नास्]तु केचन प्रबन्धाः प्रकाश्यन्ते ॥

The story of Devabodhi does not occur in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi.*

6. There is a MS. of this rare work in the *Deccan College Collection of 1880/81*, see Kielhorn, *Report of 1880/81*, Ap. pp. 32-34. The emperor (*cakravartin*) Ajayadeva, whom Yas'aḥpāla served, might be Ajayapāla, the successor of Kumārapāla, who is often called Ajayadeva. The title Cakravartin prevents us from thinking of any small chieftain. Otherwise one might assume,—as the action of the piece is supposed to have taken place in Thārāpadra, the present-day Tharād in Small-Marvāḍ, on the border between Rājapūtānā and Gujarāt,—that Ajayadeva might have been a former Ṭhākur of Tharād, The mention of Thārāpadra-Tharād may perhaps be explained by the assumption that Yas'aḥpāla was there civil governor of the king of Aṇhilvāḍ.

7. In the prose-introduction directly after the fifth verse of the *Maṅgala*, p. 2, ll. 3 ff., the following piece is given:

इह किल शिष्येण विनीतविनयेन श्रुतजलधिपारंगमस्य क्रियापरस्य गुरोः समीपे विधिना सर्वमध्येतव्यम् । ततो भव्योपकाराय देशना क्लेशविनाशिनी विस्तार्या । तद्विधिश्चायम् । अस्खलितममिलितमहीनाक्षरं सूत्रम् । अग्राम्यललितभङ्ग्यार्थः कथ्यः । कायगुप्तेन परितः सभ्येषु दत्तदृष्टिना यावदर्थावबोधं वक्तव्यम् । वक्तुः प्रायेण चरितैः प्रबन्धैश्च कार्यम् । तत्र श्रीऋषभादिवर्धमानान्तानां चक्रयादीनां राज्ञां ऋषीणां चार्यरक्षितानां वृत्तानि चरितान्युच्यन्ते । तत्पश्चात्कालङ्गसा[गता]नां तु नराणां वृत्तानि प्रबन्धा इति ॥

8. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* p. 1:

श्रीगुणचन्द्रगणेशः प्रबन्धचिन्तामणिं नवं ग्रन्थम् ।
भारतमिवाभिरामं प्रथमादर्शेत्र निर्मितवान् ॥ ५ ॥
भृशं श्रुतत्वान्न कथाः पुराणाः
प्रीणन्ति चेतांसि तथा बुधानाम् ।
वृत्तैस्तदासन्नसतां प्रबन्ध-
चिन्तामणिग्रन्थमहं तनोमि ॥ ६ ॥
बुधैः प्रबन्धाः स्वधियोच्यमाना
भवन्त्यवश्यं यदि भिन्नभावाः ।
ग्रन्थे तथाप्यत्र सुसंप्रदाय-
दृष्टे न चर्चा चतुरैर्विधेया ॥ ७ ॥

9. See *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 9 where the town is called "a firm stage of might (of the faith)", and Note 16. Merutuṅga (see Note 15) adds that the town lies in the Ardhāṣṭama district. The name Ardhāṣṭama refers probably, like many similar ones, to the number of localities belonging to the district and signifies "containing twelve villages or towns". The *Modherakārdhāṣṭama* is mentioned in the grant of land of Mūlarāja, *Indian Antiquary*, vol. VI, p. 192. As regards the modern town Dhandhūkā, see Sir W. W. Hunter, *Imperial Gazetteer*, *sub voce*, and *Bombay Gazetteer*, vol IV, p. 334.

10. The year of birth is given by Jinamaṇḍana and in *Prabh. Car.* XXII, 852 (see below Note 14), compare also Note 16. In future, I shall only give the Vikrama years, because the transmutation into the Christian years cannot generally be effected with certainty.

11. The name of the father is *Cācaḥ* in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*; in Rājas'ekhara it is always, and in Jinamaṇḍana sometimes, *Cācikaḥ*. The name of the mother is written *Pāhiṇi* by Merutuṅga and Rājas'ekhara. The S'rīmoḍh Vāṇiās are numerous even to-day. There are also numerous Brahmins who call themselves after the same place S'rīmoḍh. (*Journ. B. Br. R. A. S.* Vol X, pp. 109-110). The name of both is derived from the ancient town Moḍherā, south of Aṇhilvāḍ, see Mr. K. Forbes, *Rās Mālā* p. 80.

12. The MSS. have also sometimes *Caṅgadeva*. Merutuṅga (see Note 15) says that Pāhini belonged to the Cāmuṇḍāgotra, and that her son's name therefore began with *cā*. *Cāṅga* or *Caṅga* may, however, be connected with the Des'ī word *caṅgam*, Sindhī *caṅgu*, 'good', and Marāthī, *cāṁgalā*, 'good'.

13. *Prābhāvakacaritra* XXII, 13:

सा स्त्रीचूडामणिश्चिन्तामणिं स्वप्नेन्यदैक्षत ।
दत्तं निजगुरूणां च भक्त्या...चेशतः ॥ १३ ॥
चं[चान्]द्रगच्छसरःपद्मं तत्रास्ते मण्डितो गुणैः ।
प्रद्युम्नसूरिशिष्यश्रीदेवचन्द्रमुनीश्वरः ॥ १४ ॥

आव[च]ख्यौ पाहिनी प्रातः स्वप्नमस्वप्नसूचितम् ।
तत्पुरः स तदर्थं व [च] शास्त्रदृढ[दृष्टं] जगौ गुरु[ः] ॥१५॥
जैनशासनपाथोधिकौस्तुभः संभवी सुतः ।
ते च स्तं[स्त]वकृतो यस्य देवा अपि सुवृत्ततः ॥ १६ ॥
श्रीवीतरागविंबी[बिम्बा]नां प्रतिष्ठादोहदं दधौ ।........
तस्याथ पञ्चमे वर्षे वर्षीयस इवाभवत् ।
मतिः सद्गुरुशुश्रूषाविधौ विधुरितैनसः ॥ २५ ॥
अस्य[न्य]दा मोढचैत्यान्तः प्रभूणां चैत्यवदनम् ।
कुर्वतां पाहिनी प्रायात् म[स]पुत्रा तत्र पुण्यभूः ॥ २६ ॥
सा व[च] प्रादक्षिण्यं दत्वा यावर्त्कु[त्कुर्यात्] स्तुतिं जिने ।
चन्द्रदेवो निषद्यायां तावन्नि[न्य]वि[वी]विशद्गुः [गुरोः] ॥ २७ ॥
स्मरसि त्वं महास्वप्नं यं तदाल्योकयिष्यसि[लोकवत्यसि] ।
तस्याभिज्ञानानमीक्षस्व स्वयं पुत्रेण ते कृतम् ॥ २८ ॥
इत्युक्त्वा गुरुभिः पुत्रः सधनदेन नन्दनः [संघानन्दविवर्धनः?] ।
कल्पवृक्ष इवाप्रार्थि स जनन्या[ः] समीपतः ॥ २९ ॥
सा प्राह प्रार्थ्यतामस्य पिता युक्तमिदं ननु ।
ते तदीयाननुज्ञाया भीताः किमपि नाभ्यधुः ॥ ३० ॥
अलङ्घ्यत्वाद् गुरोर्वाच[ा]माचारस्थितया तया ।
दूनयापि सुतस्नेहादार्प्यत स्य[स्व]प्नसंस्मृतेः ॥ ३१ ॥
तमादाय स्तम्भत[ी]र्थे जग्मुः श्रीपार्श्वमन्दिरे ।
माघे सितचतुर्दश्यां ब्राह्मे धिर्[ण्]ये शते[नै]र्दिने ॥ ३२ ॥
[धि]ष्ण्ये तथाष्टमे धर्मस्थिते चन्द्रे वृषोपगे ।
लग्ने बृहस्तौलु (?) स्थितयो [ः] सूर्यभौमयोः ॥ ३३ ॥
श्रीमानुदयनस्तस्य दीक्षोत्सवमकारयत् ।
सोमचन्द्र इति ख्यातं नाम[मा]स्य गुरवो ददुः ॥ ३४ ॥

The verses already given by Klatt, *Indian Antiquary* Vol. XII, p. 254, Note 55, which enumerate the most important events in Hemacandra's life, are:

शरवेदेश्वरे ११४५ वर्षे कार्त्तिके पूर्णिमानिशि ।
जन्माभवत् प्रभोर्व्योमबाणशम्भौ ११५० व्रतं तथा ॥ ८५२ ॥
रसषड्[डी]श्वरे ११६६ सूरिप्रतिष्ठा[ष्ठा] समजायत ।
नन्दद्व्यरवौ १२२९ वर्षेवसानमभवत् प्रभोः ॥ ८५३ ॥

14. In the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, Merutuṅga makes (p. 207) Mantrin Udayana relate the story of Hemacandra's youth in the following manner:

अन्यदा श्रीहेमचन्द्रस्य लोकोत्तरैर्गुणैरपहृतहृदयो नृपतिर्मन्त्रिश्रुदयनमिति पप्रच्छ । यदीदृशं पुरुषरत्नं समस्तवंशावतंसे वंशे देशे च समस्तपुण्यप्रवेशिनि निःशेषगुणाकारे नगरे च कस्मिन् समुत्पन्नमिति । नृपादेशादनु स मन्त्री जन्मप्रभृति तच्चरित्रं पवित्रमित्थमाह । अर्धाष्टमनामनि देशे धन्धुकाभिधाने नगरे श्रीमन्मोढवंशे चाचिगनामा व्यवहारी । सतीजनमातल्लिका जिनशासनदेवीव तत्सधर्मचारिणी शरीरिणीव श्रीः पाहिणीनाम्नी । चामुण्डगोत्रजयोराद्याक्षरेणाङ्कितनामा तयोः पुत्रश्चाङ्गदेवः समजनि । स चाष्टवर्षदेश्यः श्रीदेवचन्द्राचार्येषु श्रीपत्तनात्प्रस्थितेषु धन्धुक्के श्रीमोढवसहिकायां देवनमस्करणाय प्राप्तेषु सिंहासनस्थित-तदीयनिषद्योपरि सवयोभिः शिशुभिः समं रममाणः सहसा निषसाद । तदङ्गप्रत्यङ्गानां जगद्विलक्षणानि लक्षणानि निरीक्ष्य । अयं यदि क्षत्रियकुले जातस्तदा सार्वभौमश्चक्रवर्ती । यदि वणिग्विप्रकुले जातस्तदा महामात्यः । चेद्दर्शनं प्रतिपद्यते तदा युगप्रधान इव तुर्ये युगेऽपि कृतयुगमवतारयति । स आचार्य इति विचार्य तन्नगरवास्तव्यैर्व्यवहारिभिः समं तल्लिप्सया चाचिगगृहं प्राप्य तस्मिंश्चाचिगे ग्रामान्तरभाजि तत्पत्न्या विवेकिन्या स्वागतादिभिः परितोषितः श्रीसंघस्त्वत्पुत्रं याचितुमिहागत इति व्याहरन् । अथ सा हर्षाश्रूणि मुञ्चन्ती स्वं रत्नगर्भं मन्यमाना । श्रीसंघस्तीर्थकृतां मान्यः स मत्पुत्रं याचत इति हर्षास्पदे विषादः । यत

एतत्पिता नितान्तमिथ्यादृष्टिः । अपरं तादृशोऽपि सम्प्रति ग्रामे न । तैः स्वजनैस्त्वया दीयतामित्यभिहिते स्वदोषोत्तरणाय मात्रामात्रं गुणपात्रं पुत्रस्तेभ्यो गुरुभ्यो ददे । तदनन्तरं तया श्रीदेवचन्द्रसूरिरिति तदीयमभिनिधानमबोधि । तैर्गुरुभिः सोऽपि शिशुः शिष्यो भविष्यसीति पृष्ट ओमित्युच्चरन् प्रतिनिवृत्तैस्तैः समं कर्णावत्यामाजगाम । मन्त्र्युदयनगृहे तत्सुतैः समं बालधारकैः पाल्यमानो यावदास्ते तावता ग्रामान्तरादागतश्चाचिगस्तं वृत्तान्तं परिज्ञाय पुत्रदर्शनावधि संन्यस्तसमस्ताहारस्तेषां गुरूणां नाम मत्वा कर्णावतीं प्राप्य तद्वसतावुपेत्य कुपितोऽपि तानीषत् प्रणम्य गुरुभिः सुतानुसारेणोपलक्ष्य विचक्षणतया विविधाभिरावर्जनाभिरावर्जितस्तत्रानीतेनोदयनमन्त्रिणा धर्मबन्धुबुद्ध्या निजमन्दिरे नीत्वा ज्यायःसहोदरभक्त्या भोजयांचक्रे । तदनु चाङ्गदेवं सुतं तदुत्सङ्गे निवेश्य पञ्चाङ्गप्रसादसहितं दुकूलत्रयं प्रत्यक्षं लक्षत्रयं चोपनीय सभक्तिकमावर्जितस्तं प्रति चाचिगः प्राह । क्षत्रियस्य मूल्येऽशीत्यधिकसहस्त्रं तुरगस्य मूल्ये पञ्चाशदधिकानि सप्तदश शतानि । अकिञ्चित्करस्यापि वणिजो मूल्ये नवनवतिकलभाः । एतावता नवनवतिलक्षा भवन्ति । त्वं तु लक्षत्रयमर्पयन्नौदार्यच्छद्मना कार्पण्यं प्रादुष्कुरुषे । मदीयः सुतस्तावदनर्घ्यो भवदीया च भक्तिरनर्घ्यतमा । तदस्य मूल्ये सा भक्तिरस्तु । शिवनिर्माल्यमिवास्पृश्यो मे द्रविणसंचयः । इत्थं चाचिगे सुतस्य स्वरूपमभिदधाने प्रमोदपूरितचित्तः स मन्त्र्यकुण्ठोत्कण्ठतया तं परिरभ्य साधु साध्विति वदन् श्रीमान् उदयनः प्राह । मम पुत्रतया समर्पितो योगिमर्कट इव सर्वेषां जनानां नमस्कारं कुर्वन् केवलमपमानपात्रं भविता । गुरूणां दत्तस्तु गुरुपदं प्राप्य बालेन्दुरिव त्रिभुवननमस्करणीयो जायते । यथोचितं विचार्य व्याहरेत्यादिष्टः स भवद्विचार एव प्रमाणमिति वदन् गुरुपार्श्वे नीतः सुतं गुरुभ्योऽदीदपत् । तदनु सुतस्य प्रव्रज्याकरणोत्सवश्चाचिगेन चक्रे ॥

The above text does not agree exactly with the edition. A few better readings have been inserted from the above-mentioned MSS. Merutuṅga's language is here, as generally in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, very much mixed with Gujarati idioms. The word *vasahikā*, which occurs above, line 5 of the Skt. text, means a set of buildings in which there are a temple and a monastery, and corresponds to the term *basti* i. e. *vasati* which is used by the Digambaras.

15. *Prabandhakoṣa*, pp. 98f.:

ते विहरन्तो धन्धुक्कपुरं गूर्जरधरासुराष्ट्रासंधिस्थं गताः । तत्र देशनाविस्तरः । सभायामेकदा नेमिनागनामा श्रावकः समुत्थाय देवचन्द्रसूरीन् जगौ । भगवन्नयं मोढज्ञातीयो मद्भगिनीपाहिणीकुक्षिसूष्टकुरचाधि[चि]कनन्दनश्चाङ्गदेवनामा भवतां देशनां श्रुत्वा प्रबुद्धो दीक्षां याचते । अस्मिंश्च गर्भस्थे मम भग्[गि]न्या सहकारतरुः स्वप्ने दृष्टः । स व [च] स्थानान्तरे गुप्तस्तत्र महतीं फलस्फातिमायाति स्म । गुरव आहुः । स्थानान्तरगतस्यास्य महिमा भविष्यते । महत् पात्रमसौ योग्यः सुलक्षणो दीक्षणीयः । केवलं पित्रोरनुज्ञा ग्राह्या । गतौ मातुलभाग्[गि]नेयौ पाहिणीं[णी]चावि[चि]कान्तिकम् । उक्ता व्रतवासना । कृतस्ताभ्यां प्रतिषेधः । करुणवचनशतैश्चाङ्गदेवो दीक्षां लेभे ।

16. Although the narrative scarcely offers anything new, I am giving the particular passage of the *Kumarapālacarita*, so as to show by an example, how Jinamaṇḍana is in the habit of making use of his predecessors. According to No. 286, pp. 27-31, the story to which is prefaced a report about Devacandra that is borrowed from the *Prabandhakoṣa* (see Note 20), reads as follows:—

श्रीदेवचन्द्रसूरय एकदा विहरन्तो धन्धूकपुरे प्रापुः । तत्र मोढवंशे वा[चा]चिक श्रेष्टी[ष्ठी] । पाहिना[नी] भार्या । तयान्येद्युः स्वप्ने चिन्तामणिर्दृष्टः परं गुरुभ्यो दत्तः । तदा तत्रागतः[ताः] श्रीदेवचन्द्रगुरवः पृष्टाः स्वप्नफलम् । गुरुभिरूचे । पुत्रो भावी तव चिन्तामणिमु[मू]ल्यः । परं स सूरिराड् जैनशासनभासको भविता गुरूणां रत्नदानादिति । गुरुवचः श्रुत्वा मुदिता पाहिनी तद्दिने गर्भं बभार । संवत् ११४५ कार्त्तिकपूर्णिमारात्रिसमये पुत्रजन्मः[म] ।

तदा वागशरीरासीद्व्योम्नि (श्रीभाव्ये) [भाव्यः] स तत्त्ववित् ।
निज[जिन]वज् जिनधर्मस्य स्थापकः सूरिसे[शे]खरः ॥ १ ॥

जन्ममोच्छ[त्स]वपूर्वं चाङ्गदेवेति नाम दत्तम् । क्रमेण पञ्चवार्षिको मात्रा सह मोढवसहिकायां देववन्दनायागतो बालचापल्यस्वभावेन देवनमस्करणार्थमागतं[त-] श्रीदेवचन्द्रगुरुनिषद्यायां निषन्नः[ण्णः] । तथा दृष्ट्वा गुरुभिरूचे पाहिना-[नि] । सुश्राविके स्वरसि स्वप्नविचारं पूर्वकथितं संवादफलम् । बालकाङ्गलक्षणानि विलोक्य मातुरग्रेकथि । यद्ययं क्षत्रियकुले तदा सार्वभौमो नरेन्द्र[ः] । यदि ब्र[ब्रा]ह्मणवणिक्कुले तदा महामात्यः । च[चे]द् दीक्षां गृह्णाति तदा युगप्रधान इव तुर्ये युगे कृतयुगमवत्[ता]रयतीति । सा पाहिनी गुरुवचोमृतोल्लासिता ससुता गृहं गता । गुरवोऽपि शालायामागत्य श्रीसंघमाकार्य गता[ः] श्रावका[ः] श्र[श्रे]ष्टि[ष्ठि]गृहे । वाचि[चाचि]के ग्रामान्तरं गते वा[पा]हिन्या श्रीसंघो गृहागतः स्वागतकरणाद्विना तोषितः । मार्गितश्च[श्चा]ङ्गदेवः । हृष्टा पाहिनी हर्षाश्रूणि मुञ्चन्ति[न्ती] स्वां रत्नगर्भां मन्यमानापि

चिन्तातुरा जाता । एकत एतत्पिता मिथ्यादृष्टिः । तादृशोऽपि ग्रामे नास्ति । एकतस्तु श्रीसंघो गृहागतः पुत्रं याचत इति किं कर्तव्यं मूढचित्ता क्षणमभूत् । तट(द)नु ॥

कल्पद्रुमस्तस्य गृहेऽवतीर्णश्चिन्तामणिस्तस्य करे लु[लु]लोठ ।
त्रैलोक्यलक्ष्मीरपि तां वृण[णी]ते गृहाङ्गणं यस्य पुनीते संघः ॥ १ ॥

तथा ॥
उर्वी गुर्वी तदनु जलदः सागरः कुम्भजन्मा
व्यू[व्यो]मा[या]तौ रविहिमकरौ तौ च यस्यांह्रिपीठे ।
स प्रौढश्रीर्जिनपरिवृढः सोऽपि यस्य प्रणन्ता
स श्रीसंघस्त्रिभुवनगुरुः कस्य क[किं] स्यान् न मान्यः ॥ २ ॥

इति प्रत्युत[त्प]न्नमतिर्माता श्रीसंघेन सम[मं] गुरून् कल्पतरूनिव गृहागताञ् ज्ञात्वावसरज्ञा स्वजनानुमतिं लात्वा नि[ज]तुं[पु]त्रं श्रीगुरुभ्यो ददौ । ततः श्रीगुरुभिः श्रीसंघसमक्षम् । ह[हे] वत्स श्रीत्[ती]र्थंकरचक्रवति-[र्ति] गणधरैरासेवितां सुरासुरनिकरनायकमहन्यां[नीयां] मुक्तिकान्तास[सं]गमदूतं[तीं] दीक्षां त्वं लास्यसीति प्रोक्ते । स च-कुमारः प्राग्भव[ग्भाव]चारित्रावरणीयकर्मक्षयोपस[श]मेन संयमश्रवणमात्रसंजातपरसंवेगः सहं[ह]सा ओमित्युवाच । ततो मात्रा स्वजनैश्चानुमतं पुत्रं संयमानुरागपवित्रं लात्वा श्रीतीर्थयात्रां विधाय कर्णावतीं जग्मुः श्रीगुरवः । तत्रोदयनमन्त्रिगृहे तत्सुतैः समं बालधारकैः पाल्यमानः सकलसंघलोकमान्यः संयमपरिणामधन्यो वैनयिकादिगुणविज्ञो यावदास्ते तावता ग्रामान्तरादागतश्चाचिगः पत्नीनिचे[वे]दितश्रीगुरुसंघागमपुत्रार्पणादिवृत्तान्तः पुत्रदर्शनावधि [सं]न्यस्ताहारः कर्णावत्यां गतः । तत्र वन्दिता गुरवः । श्रुत्वा[ता] धर्मदेशना । सुतानुसारेणोपलक्ष्य विचक्षणतयाभाणि श्रीगुरुभिः ।

कुलं पवित्रं जननी कृतार्थी
वसुन्धरा भाग्यवती च तेन ।
अवाक्यमार्गे सुखसिन्धुमग्ने
लीनं परब्रह्मणि यस्य चेतः ॥ १ ॥

कल[लं]कं कुरुते कश्चित् कुलेऽतिविमले सुतः ।
धननाशकरः कश्चिद् व्यसनैर्गुणनाशनैः ॥ २ ॥
पित्रोः संतापकः कोऽपि यौवने प्र्य[प्रेय]सीमु[सु]खः ।
बाल्येऽपि नि[म्रि]यते कोऽपि स्यात् कोऽपि विकलेन्द्रियः ॥ ३ ॥
सर्वाङ्गसुन्दरः किं तु ज्ञानवान् गुणनीरधिः ।
श्रीजिनेन्द्रपथाध्वय:[न्यः] प्राप्यते पुण्यतः सुतः ॥ ४ ॥

इति श्रीगुरुमुखादाकर्ण्य संजातप्रन्दः[मोदः] प्रसन्नचित्तश्चाचिगस्तत्र श्रीगुरुप्दा[पादा]रविन्दनमस्यार्थं समायातेनोदयनमन्त्रिणा धर्मबान्धवधिया निजगृहे नीत्वा भोजयांचक्रे । तदनु चङ्ग[चाङ्ग]देवं तदुच्छ[त्स]ङ्गे निवेश्य पञ्चाङ्गप्रसादपूर्वकं दुकु[कूल]त्रयं चोपनीय सभक्तिकमावर्ति[र्जि]तश्चाचिगः सानन्दं मन्त्रिणमवादुत्[दीत्] । मन्त्रिन् क्षत्रियस्य मूल्येऽशीत्यधिकः सहस्रः १०८० । अश्वमूल्ये पञ्चाशद[शद]धिकानि सप्तदश शतानि [sic !] सामान्यस्यापि वणिजो नवनवति ९९ गजेन्द्राः । एतावता नवनवतिलक्षा भवन्ति । त्वं तु लक्षत्रयमर्पयन् स्थूल-लक्षायसे । अतो मत्सु[त्सु]तोनर्घ्यस्त्वदीया भक्तिस्त्वनर्घ्यतमा । तदस्य मूल्ये सा भक्तिरस्तु । न तु मे द्रव्येण प्रयोजनमस्य[स्त्य]स्पृश्यमेतन् मम शिवनिर्माल्यमिव । दत्तो मया पुत्रो भवतामिति । चाचिगवचः श्रुत्वा प्रमुदितमना मन्त्री तं पद[रि]रभ्य साधु युक्तमेतदिति वदन् पुनस्तं प्रत्युवाच । त्वयायं पुत्रो ममार्पितः । परं योग[गि]मर्कट इव सर्वेषामप[पि] जनानां नमस्कारं कुर्वन् केवलमपत्रपापात्रं भविता । श्रीगुरूणां तु समर्पितः श्रीगुरुपदं प्राप्य बाल-[ले]न्दुरिव महती[तां] महनीयो भवतीति विचार्यतां यसो[थो]चितम् । ततः स भवद्विचार एव प्रमाणमिति वदन् सु[स]कलश्रीसंघसमक्षं रत्नकरण्डमिव रक्षणीयमुद[दु]म्बरपुष्पमिव दुर्लभं पुत्रं क्षमाश्रमणपूर्वकं गुरूणां समर्पयामास । श्रीगुरुभिरभाणि ।

धनधान्यस्य दातार [:] सन्ति क्वचन केचन ।
पुत्रभिक्षाप्रदः कोऽपि दुर्लभः पुण्यवान् पुमान् ॥ १ ॥
धनधान्यादिसंपत्सु लोके सारा न[तु] संततिः ।
तत्रापि पुत्ररत्नं तु तस्य दानं महत्तमम् ॥ २ ॥

स्वर्गस्थाः पितरो वा[वी]क्ष[क्ष्य] दीक्षितं जिनदीक्षया ।
मोक्षाभिलाषिणं पुत्रं तृप्ता[:] स्युः स्वर्गसंसदिन्[दि] ॥ ३ ॥

महाभारतेप्यभाणि ।

तावद् भ्रू[भ्र]मन्ति संसारे पितरः पिण्डकाङ्क्षिणः ।
याव[त्] कुले विशुद्धात्मा यती[तिः] पुत्रो न जायते ॥ १ ॥

इति श्रुत्वा प्रमुदितेन चाचिगेनोदयनमन्त्रिणा च प्रव्रज्यामहोत्सदः[वः] कारितः । सोमदेवमुनिर्नाम दत्तं क्वचित् सोमचन्द्रमुनिरिति वा । श्रीविक्रमात् ११४५ श्रीहेमसूरीआं[णां] जन्म । ११५४ दीक्षा च ।

In the last part of the narrative the text in the MS. is in great disorder, because the injudicious copyist inserted in the wrong order the suplements which stood in the margin of the original. At the end of the work, p. 283, the dates of the chief events in Hemacandra's life are given once again. There we read, as at the end of the *Prabhāvakacaritra*:

संवत् ११४५ कार्त्तिकपूर्णिमानिशि जन्म श्रीहेमसूरीणां ।
संवत् ११५० दीक्षा संवत् ११६६ सूरिपदं संवत् १२२९ स्वर्गः ।

These data may be sufficient to justify the above-expressed judgment (p. 3) as regards Jinamaṇḍana, and to show that his *Caritra* is absolutely worthless as a source, except where he has made extracts from inaccessible works.

17. The above statements are based upon detailed investigations which I made in various localities in Western India in the years 1873-1879. First of all I heard in Rājputānā from a good source, that several Yatis whose acquaintance I made, and one of whom occupied an important position, owed their existence to the errors of Brahmin widows. Later, in 1877 this was confirmed to me by Yatis in Kheḍā, who quite frankly named the mothers of their *Chellas* and related through whom they had received them.. In 1873 in Nāmḍol in Rājputānā I came to know of one case, in which a Yati had taken in an orphaned child at the time of the famine of 1868/69 and saved it from death by starvation. The boy who visited me with his Guru, was about eight years old at that time. He had already learnt parts of the Sūtras and Stotras, and recited the beginning of the Das'avaikālika Sūtra, and also the Bhaktāmara quite nicely. He had not yet had his first consecration. A case where a little Jain boy was given by his parents to a monk at the request of the latter as a pupil and with the intention of making him a Yati, came to my knowledge in 1875 or 1876 in Surat. On closer acquaintance, neither the Yatis nor the laymen in other towns also, denied that the manner of recruiting their religious orders was not carried on in accordance with the ideals of their sacred doctrine, and they confessed that, in the Duhṣamāra or in the Kaliyuga they just helped themselves as best they could.

18. About the position of Karṇāvatī see K. Forbes *Rās Mālā*, pp. 79-80, especially Note 1. Udayana's immigration is related in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 136-138 and in the *Kumārapālacarita* pp. 67-68. In the first-mentioned passage we read that Ūdā or Udayana came from Mārvāḍ to Gujarāt to purchase melted butter. An omen induced him to settle in Karṇāvatī with his family. He acquired riches there, and when he was having the groundwork for a new house laid with tiles, he found a great treasure. In consequence thereof, he was known as "counsellor" Udayana, and became famous. He had a temple, the Udayanavihāra, built in Karṇāvatī. By various wives he had four sons: Vāhaḍadeva [Vāgbhaṭa], Ambaḍa [Āmrabhaṭa], Bohaḍa and Sollāka. The names of the last two vary in part in the various MSS. Jinamaṇḍana repeats Merutuṅga's statements, but adds that Udayana belonged to the S'rīmālī caste and was appointed as a Mentrin by Siddharāja in Stambhatīrtha, **ततः सिद्धेशेन स्तम्भतीर्थे मन्त्री कृतः.**

19. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 232, and above p. 46.

20. The accounts about Devacandra stand at the beginning of the ***Hemasūriprabandha.*** With the omission of the story of the conversion of Rāṇā Yas'obhadra, they read as follows:—

पूर्ण[चन्द्र]गच्छे श्रीदत्तसूरिप्राज्ञो वागडदेशे वटपद्रं पुरं गतः । तत्र स्वामी यशोभद्रनामा राणक ऋद्धिमान् । तत्सौधान्तिक उपाश्रयः श्राद्धैर्दत्तः । रात्रावुन्मुद्रचन्द्रातपायां राणकेन ऋषयो दृष्टा उपाश्रये निषण्णः । ....तस्य राणश्रीयशोभद्रस्य गीतार्थत्वात् सूरिपदं जातं श्रीयशोभद्रसूरिरिरि[ति] नाम । तदीयपट्टे प्रद्युम्नसूरिर्ग्रन्थकारः । तत्पदे श्रीगुणसेनसूरिः । श्रीयशोभद्रसूरिपट्टे [?] श्रीदेवचन्द्रसूरयः । ठाणवृत्तिशान्तिनाथचरितादि महाशास्त्रकरणनिर्व्यूढप्र-[प्रा]ज्ञप्रारभाराः ....

The portion of Rājas'ekhara's narrative, immediately following, is given above, in Note 15. In the *Kumārapālacaritra*, pp. 25 ff. Jinamaṇḍana repeats the story told by Rājas'ekhara. The beginning reads, p. 25, line 2: कोटिकगणे वज्रशाखायां चन्द्रगच्छे श्रीदत्तसूरयो विहरन्तो वागडदेशस्थः वटपद्रपुरे प्रापुः । The series of teachers is given as follows:—तत्पट्टे प्रद्युम्नसूरिः । तच्छिष्यः श्रीगुणसेनसूरिः । तत्पट्टे श्रीदेवचन्द्रसूरयः ॥ Vāgaḍa is the old name, and still used today, of the Eastern part of Kach. Hemacandra's own statement is given above, on p. 10 and in Note 66. As regards Devasūri's statement about Devacandra's *S'āntināthacarita*, see above Note 1, page 60.

21. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* pp. 239 f. Hemacandra wished to learn the secret of making gold, because Kumārapāla, like other founders of eras, intended to pay off the debts of the world, see also page 10. Devacandra's name is not mentioned in the text; simply the phrase 'Hemacandra's Guru', occurs.

22. The most important verses of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* about the years which Hemacandra had spent at school, read as follows:

सोमचन्द्रस्ततश्चन्द्रोज्वलप्रज्ञाबलादसौ ।
तर्कलक्षणसाहित्यविद्या[:] पर्यच्छि[च्छि]नद् द्रुतम् ॥ ३७ ॥ ....
प्रभावकधुराधुर्यममुं सूरिपदोचिन्तः [चितम्] ।
विज्ञाय स[सं]घमासन्य[मामन्त्र्य] सु[गु]रवोमन्त्रयन्निति ॥ ४७ ॥
योग्यं शिष्यं पदे न्यस्य स्वयं कार्यं [क]र्तुमौचिती ।
अस्मत्पूर्वे सुम्[षाम्] आचारा[:] सदा विहि[दि]तपूर्विङा[म्] ॥ ४८ ॥
तदैव विज्ञदैवज्ञप्रताल्लग्नं व्यावा[चा]रयन् । ....
मुहूर्ते[र्ते] पूर्वनिर्णीते क्त[कृ]तनन्दीविधिक्रमाः ।
ध्वनच्चू[त्तू]र्यरवोन्मुद्रमङ्गला[ला]चारबन्धुरः[राः] ॥ ५६ ॥
शब्दाद्वैतेथ विश्रान्ते समाय[मये] योमि [चोषि] ते सति ।
पूरकापूरि[त]स्वाम[स्वर्ण]कुम्भकोक्रेदमेदुराः ॥ ५७ ॥
श्रवणेगुरुकर्पूरचन्दनद्रवचर्चिते ।
कृतिनः सोमचन्द्रस्य [ब्रह्म]निष्टा[ष्ठा]न्तरात्ममः[नः] ॥ ५८ ॥
श्रीगौतमादिसूर[री]शैराराधितमाबाधितम् ।
श्रीदेवचन्द्रगुरवः सूरिमन्त्रमचीकथनः[थन्] ॥ ५९ ॥
पञ्चभिः कुलकम् ॥
तिरस्कृतकलाकेलिः कलाकेलिकुलाश्रयः ।
हेमचन्द्रप्रभु[:] श्रीमन्नाम्ना विख्यातिमाप सः ॥ ६० ॥
तदा च पाहिनी स्नेहवाहिनी सु[सु]त उत्तमे ।
तत्र चारित्रमादत्ताविहस्ता गुरुहस्ततः ॥ ६१ ॥
प्रवर्तिनी[र्नीं] प्रतिष्टां[ष्ठां] च दापयामास नम्रगीः ।
तदैवा निवाचार्यो (?) गुरुभ्यः सभ्यसाक्षिकम् ॥ ६२ ॥
सिंहासनासनं तस्या अन्वमानयदेष च ।
कटरे (?) जननीभक्तिरुत्तमां[मानां] क्षो[कषो]पलः ॥ ६३ ॥

The story of the journey is omitted because the majority of the verses are very badly damaged. It is in verses 38-46. Merutuṅga makes his account much shorter. The end of the passage, as given above, in Note 15, reads:-

अथ च कुम्भयोनिरिवाप्रतिमप्रतिभाभिरामतया समस्तवाङ्मयाम्भोधिमुष्टिंधयोभ्यस्तसमस्तविद्यास्थानो हेमचन्द्र इति गुरुदत्तनाम्ना प्रतीतः सकलसिद्धान्तोपनिषन्निषण्णधीः षट्त्रिंशता गुणैरलंकृततनुर्गुरुभिः सूरिपदेभिषिक्तः । इति मन्त्र्युदयनोदितं जन्मप्रभृति वृत्तान्तं आकर्ण्य नृपतिर्मुमुदेतराम् ॥

Therefore Merutuṅga does not know the second name Somacandra. His assertion that Udayana related the story of Hemacandra's youth to King Kumārapāla contains a serious anachronism. As Udayana immigrated to Gujarat in the Vikrama-Saṁvat 1150, and as Kumārapāla ascended the throne in the Vikram year 1199, and is supposed to have waged several wars before this conversation took place, Udayana could not have still been alive.

Jinamaṇḍana, *Kum. Car.* p. 31, line 12 up to p. 36, line 5, reports a good deal, but merely absurd stories, about Hemacandra's apprenticeship-time. He relates, (pp. 31-42), that Somadeva received the name Hemacandra because, at the beginning of his apprenticeship, he transmuted coal into gold (*hema*) at the house of a S'resthin named Dhana. Then he contradicts himself on p. 36, where he agrees in the main with the *Prabhāvakacaritra*. Then, instead of one journey of Somadeva's and one supernatural apparition, he speaks of two. The first journey was to be to Kās'mīr, and the second to the Gauḍa land in company of a Devendra and of the famous commentator Malayagiri. On the first occasion the goddess Sarasvatī appears, and on the second S'āsanadevatā. Finally we hear that a merchant, named Dhanada, had the honour of an Ācārya given to Somadeva in the Vikrama year 1166 with the consent of his Guru and of the Saṁgha. The date occurs three times in Jinamaṇḍana, is the same each time, and agrees with that of the already-mentioned verse of the *Prabhāvakacaritra, cf.* also Bhāṇḍārkar, *Report on the Search etc.* 1883/84. p. 14.

23. *Alaṅkāracūḍāmaṇi* I. 4:

मन्त्रादेरौपाधिके ॥ ४ ॥

मन्त्रदेवतानुग्रहादिप्रभवौपाधिकी प्रतिभा । इयमप्यावरणक्षयोपशमनिमित्तैव दृष्टोपाधिनिबन्धनत्वात्त्वौपाधिकीत्युच्यते ॥

24. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 64-73:

श्रीहेमचन्द्रसूरिः श्रीसंघसागा[ग]रकौस्तुभः ।
विजहारान्यदा श्रीमदणहिल्लपुर[रं] पुरम् ॥ ६४ ॥
श्रीसिद्ध[भू]भृदन्येद्यू राजपाटिकाय व[च]रन् ।
हेमचन्द्रप्रभु[भुं] वीक्ष्य तटस्थविपणिस्थितम् ॥ ६५ ॥
निरुध्य द्विप[त्व]कासन्ने गज[गज]प्रसरमङ्कुशात[त्] ।
किंचिद् भणिष्यते[थे]त्याह प्रोवाच प्र[भु]रप्यथ ॥ ६६ ॥
कारय प्रसरं सिद्ध हस्तिराजमशङ्कितम् ।
त्रस्यन्तु दिग्गजाः किं तौ[तैर्] भूस्त्वयैवोद्धृति[ता] यतः ॥ ६७ ॥
श्रुत्वेति भूपतिः प्राह तुष्टिपुष्टः सुधीश्वरः ।
मध्याह्ने मे प्रमोदायागन्तव्यं भवता सदा ॥ ६८ ॥
तत्पूर्वं दर्शनां[नं] तस्य जज्ञे कुत्रापि म[त]त्क्षणे ।
आनन्दमंदिरे राज्ञा यत्राजर्यमभूत् प्रभोः ॥ ६९ ॥
अन्यदा सिद्धराजोपि जित्वा माल्व[लव]मण्डलम् ।
समाजगाम तस्मै वा[चा]शिषं दर्शनिनो ददुः ॥ ७० ॥
तत्र श्रीहेमचन्द्रोपि सूरिर्भूरिकलानिधिः ।
उवाच काव्य[म]व्यममतिश्र[श]यनिदर्शनम् ॥ ७१ ॥

तथा हि ।

भूमिं कामगवि स्वगोमयरसैरासिञ्च रत्नाकरा
मुक्तास्वस्तिकमातनुध्वमुडुप त्वं पूर्णकुम्भीभव ।
धृत्वा कल्पतरोर्दलानि सरलैर्दिग्वारणास्तोरणा—
न्याधत्त स्वकरैर्विजित्य जगतीं नन्वैति सिद्धाधिपः ॥ ७२ ॥
व्याख्याविभूषिते वृत्ते [हेमचन्द्र]द्रविभोस्ततः ।
आजुहावावनीयात[पालः] सूरिं सौधे पुनः पुनः ॥ ७३ ॥

Verse 72 has been given, after comparison with the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, as also with the other work mantioned below (Note 33). All the sources available to me give नन्वेति in the fourth Pāda. In spite of this, however, only नन्वैति can be correct.

The above narrative of the first meeting of Hemacandra with Siddharāja is also found in the *Kumārapālacarita.* There, however, the verse which is supposed to have been written by him (p. 36, lines 9-11), runs :–

सिद्धराज राज[गज]राजं उच्चकैः
कारय प्रसरमेतमग्रतः ।
संत्रसन्तु हर्ती[रिती]मतंगजास्
त:[तैः] किमद्य भवतैव भूर्धृता ॥

The divergent form proves that Jinamaṇḍana has used another source.

25. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 144.

26. The *Kumārapālacarita* gives the following anecdotes immediately after the first meeting. (1) Hemacandra declares the doctrines of all sects to be equally saving: pp. 36-38; (2) Hemacandra mentions the qualities of a man who is worthy (*pātra*) of pious gifts: pp. 38-39; (3) Hemacandra mentions to the King in Siddhapur the difference between Mahādeva and the Jina: pp. 39-40; (4) Some pious foundations of Jayasiṁha.

As regards the data, varying in time, of the other sources concerning these stories, see pp. 21 f.

27. Colebrooke *Misc. Essays* II, p. 275, ed. Cowell, where it is also shown that Yas'ovarman probably ascended the throne only in the year V. S. 1190. The contradictory statement in the *Kīrtikaumudī* II, 32, according to which the prince of Mālvā, Naravarman, who was defeated by Jayasiṁha, was Yas'ovarman's predecessor, may be left without any consideration. For Yas'ovarman is distinctly mentioned in the *Dvyās'rayakāvya*, and one may certainly trust that Hemacandra knew the name of the king who was defeated by his lord.

28. According to Forbes' extracts from the *Dvyās'rayakāvya* (*Indian Antiquary*, vol. IV. pp. 266 f.), Jayasiṁha did the following deeds after his return from Mālvā: (1) He remained for a time in Siddhapura-S'rīsthala, and had the Rudra Māla temple, or properly speaking the Rudramahālaya temple restored, and had a temple of Mahāvīra built; (2) he made a pilgrimage to Somnāthpattan and Girnār; (3) After his return to Aṇhilvāḍ, he had the Sahasraliṅga-lake dug, and caused many other gardens to be laid out. As Hemacandra in other places, where we can control him, gives events in their proper order, we may trust him here too. If we do this, then it goes without saying that Jayasiṁha must have reigned for a number of years after his return from Mālvā, and that this event could not have taken place later than the Vikrama year 1194.

29. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* pp. 161-171.

30. The verse is quoted by Klatt, *Indian Antiquary*, vol. XI, p. 254, Note 54. The *Prabhāvakacaritra* does not mention directly Hemacandra's presence at the disputation. However, it hints at this, by giving a verse which Hemacandra is supposed to have composed in honour of the victory of the S'vetāmbaras. We read in XXI, 253-54 :—

श्रीसिद्धहेमचन्द्राभिधान[ने] शब्दानुशासने ।
सूत्रधारः प्रभुः श्रीमान् हेमचन्द्रप्रभुर्जगौ ॥ २५३ ॥

तथा हि ।

यदि नाम कुमुदचन्द्र[न्द्रं] नाजेष्यद् देवसूरिर्हिमरुचिः ।
कटिपरिधानमधास्यत् कतमः श्वेताम्बरो जगति ॥ २५४ ॥

The verse looks as though it were written to illustrate the use of the Conditional. Kielhorn informs me that it is not to be found in the Commentary to the Grammar.

31. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XII, 74-115:

अन्यदावन्तिकोशीयपुस्तकेषु नियुक्त[क]कैः ।
दर्श्यमानेषु भूपेनश्चै[नात्रै]क्षि लक्षणपुस्तकम् ॥ ७४ ॥

किमेतदिति पप्रच्छ स्वामी ते व्यजिज्ञापन् ।
भोजव्याकरणं ह्येत[च] शब्दशास्त्रप्रवर्तने ॥ ७५ ॥

अमो[सौ] हि मालवाधीशो विद्वच्चक्रशिरोमणिः ।
शब्दालङ्कारदैवज्ञतार्कशास्त्राणि निर्ममे ॥ ७६ ॥

चिकित्साराजसिद्धान्तरम[स] वास्तू(त)दयानि च ।
अ[ङ्क]कशाकुनिकाध्यात्मस्वप्नसामुद्रिकाण्यपि ॥ ७७ ॥

ग्रन्थान्निमित्तव्याख्यानप्रश्नचूडामणीनिह ।
विवृति[तिं] वायम[चार्थस]द्भावेऽर्थशास्त्रमेधमालयोः ॥ ७८ ॥

भूपालोप्यवदत् किं नास्मत्कोषे शास्त्रपद्धतिः ।
विद्वान् कोपि कथं नास्ति देशे विश्वेपि (!) गूर्जरे ॥ ८० [७९]

सर्वे सम्भूय विद्वांसो हेमचन्द्रं व्यलोकयन् ।
महाभक्त्या राज्ञासावभ्यर्च्य प्रार्थि[तस्ततः] ॥ ८१ [८०]

शब्दव्युत्पत्तिकृच्छास्त्रं निर्मायास्मन्मनोरथम् ।
पूरयस्व महर्षे त्वं विना त्वामत्र कः प्रभुः ॥ ८२ [८१]

संक्षिप्तश्च प्रवृत्तोयं म[स]मयेस्मिन् कलापकः ।
लक्षण[णे] तत्र निष्पत्तिः शब्दाना[नां]नास्ति तादृशी ॥ ८३ [८२]

पाणिनि[ने]र्लक्षणं वेदस्याङ्गमित्यत्रवन् द्विजः ।
.... ॥ ८४ ॥

य(:)शो मम तव ख्यातिः पुण्यं च मुनिनायक[:] ।
विश्वलोकोपकाराय कुरु व्याकरणं नवम् ॥ ८५ [८४]

(का:) कार्येषु नः किलोक्तिः वा [वैः] स्मारणाये[यैं]व केवलम् ॥ ८६ [८५]

परं व्याकरणान्यष्टौ वर्तन्ते पुस्तकानि च ।
तेषां श्रीभारतीदेवीकोश एवास्तिता ध्रुवम् ॥ ८७ [८६]

आनाययतु काश्मीरदेशात्तानि स्वमानुषिः[षैः] ।
महाराजो यथा सम्यक् शब्दशास्त्रं प्रतन्यते ॥ ८८ [८७]

इति तस्योक्तमाकर्ण्य ततक्ष(क्ष)णादेव भूपतिः ।
प्रधानपुरुषान् प्रैषीद् वाग्देवीदेशमध्यतः ॥ ८९ [८८]

प्रवराख्यपुरे तत्र प्राप्तस्ते देवतां गिरम् ।
व[च]न्दनादिभिर[भ्य]र्च्य तुष्टुवुः पावनस्तवैः ॥ ९० [८९]

समादिक्षभूस्तु[क्षत् तु तैस्तु]ष्टा निजाधिष्ठा[ष्ठा]यकान् गिरा ।
मम प्रसादवित्तः श्रीहेमचन्द्रः सिठाम्बरः [श्वेताम्बरः] ॥ ९१ [९०]

ततो मूल्यन्तरस्येव मदीयस्यास्य हेतवे ।
संतप्प [संतर्प्य] प्रेष्यता[तां] प्रेष्यवर्गः[र्गं] पुस्तकसंचयं[यः] ॥ ९२ [९१]
ततः सत्कृत्य तान् सम्यग् भारतीसचिवालंसन् [वाः समम्] ।
पुस्तकान्यर्पयामासुः प्रै[प्रे]षुश्चोत्मा[सा]हपडि[ण्डि]तम् ॥ ९३ [९२]
अचिरान्नगरं स्वीयं प्रापुः दे[दें]वीप्रमादिताः[सादतः] ।
हर्षप्रकर्षसम्पन्नपुलकाङ्कुरपूरिताः ॥ ९४ [९३]
सर्वं[र्वे] विज्ञापयामासुर्भूपालाय गिरोदिता[तम्] ।
निष्टो [दृष्टं] प्रभौ हेमचन्द्रे [परि]तोषमहादरम् ॥ ९५ [९४]
इत्याकर्ण्य चमत्कारं धारयन् वसुधाधिपः ।
उवाच धन्यो महेशो (ह) [मान्यो] यत्रेदशः कृती ॥ ९६ [९५]
श्रीहेमसूरयोप्यत्रालोक्य व्याकरणव्रजम् ।
शास्त्रं चत्क[कु]र् नवं श्रीमत्सिद्धाख्यमद्भुतम् ॥ ९७ [९६]
द्वात्रिंशत्पादसंपूर्णमष्टाध्यायमुणादिस[म]त् ।
धातुपारायणा[णो]पेतं रगलि[सह-लि]ङ्गानुशासनम् ॥ ९८ [९७]
सूत्रसद्वृत्तिमत् नाममालानेकार्थसुंदश[सुन्दरम्] ।
मौलिं लक्षणशास्त्रेषु विश्वविद्वद्भिरादतः[तम्] ॥ ९९ [९८]

त्रिभिर्विशेषकम् ॥

आदौ विस्तीर्णशास्त्राणि न हि पाठ्यानि सर्वतः ।
आयुषा सकलेनापि पुमर्थयवलनानि तत् (?) ॥ १०० [९९]
संकीर्णानि व[च] दुर्बोधदोषस्थानानि कानिचित् ।
एतत्प्रमाणितं तस्माद्विभक्ति [विद्वद्भि]रधुनातनैः ॥ १०१ [१००]
श्रीमूलराजप्रभृतिराजपूर्वज[भू]भृताम् ।
वर्णवर्णन[नं] सम्बन्धं पादान्ते श्लोक [एक]कं[कः] ॥ १०२ [१०१]
तच्चतुष्कं च सर्वान्ते श्लोकौ[कै]स्त्रिंशद्भिरद्भुता ।
पञ्चाधिकै[कैः] प्रशस्तिश्च विहिता विहितैस्त[तः] ॥ १०३ [१०२]

युग्मम् ॥

राजःपुर[जगुरु]पुरोगैश्च विद्वद्भिर्वाचितं ततः ।
चक्रे वर्षत्रयर्षेव [त्रयेणैव] राज्ञा पुस्तकलेखनो[नम्] ॥ १०४ [१०३]
राजादेशान्नियुक्तैश्च सर्वस्थानेभ्य त्र[उ]द्यतैः ।
दावाहूवसच्चके [समाहूयत पत्तने] लेखकानां शतत्रयम् ॥ १०५ [१०४]
पुस्तकाः समलेख्यन्त सर्वदर्शनिनां ततः ।
प्रत्येकमेवादीयन्ताध्येतॄणामुद्यमस्पृशाम् ॥ १०६ [१०५]

विशेषकम् ॥

अङ्ग-वङ्ग-कलिङ्गेषु लाट-कर्णाट-कुङ्कणे ।
महाराष्ट्रसुराष्ट्रासु[सु] वछे[त्से] कच्छे च मालवे ॥ १०७ [१०६]
सिन्धुसौवीरनेपाले पारासीकमुरुण्डयोः ।
गङ्गापारे हरिद्वारे कासि-चे[चे]दि-गयासु च ॥ १०८ [१०७]
कु(ह)रुक्षेत्रे कन्यकुब्जे गौडश्रीकामरूपयोः ।
सपादलक्षवज्जालन्धरे च खसमध्यतः ॥ १०९ [१०८]
सिं[सिं]हलेथ महाबोधे चौडे मालवकौशिके ।
दू[इ]त्यादिविश्वदेशेषु शास्त्रं व्या[व्य]स्तार्यत स्फुटम् ॥ ११० [१०९]

चतुर्भिः कलापकम् ॥

अन्येमोय [अन्येषां च ?] निबन्धानां पुस्तकानां च विंशति[:] ।
प्राहीयत नृपेन्द्रेण कश्मी[श्मी]रेषु महादरात् ॥ १११ [११०]

एतत्तत्र गत[तं] शास्त्रं स्वीयकोशे निवेशितम् ।
सर्वो निर्वाहयेत्स्वेनादृतं देव्यास्तु का कथा ॥ ११२ [१११]

काकलो नाम कायस्थकुलकल्याणशेखरः ।
अष्टव्याकरण्य्[णाध्ये]ता प्रज्ञाविजितभोगिराट् ॥ ११३ [११२]

प्रभुस्तं दृष्टमात्रेण ज्ञाततत्वार्थमस्य च ।
शास्त्रस्य ज्ञापकं(द्)[त्वा-]शु विदधेध्यापक[कं] तथा ॥ ११४ [११३]

प्रतिमासं स च ज्ञानपञ्चम्यां पृच्छनां दधौ ।
राजा च तत्र निर्यूहान्(न) कङ्कणैः समभूषयत् ॥ ११५ [११४]

निष्पन्ना अत्र शास्त्रे च दुकूलस्वर्णभूषणैः ।
सुखासनातपत्रैश्च ते भूपालेन योजितोः[ताः] ॥ ११६ [११५]

After Verse 76 there is in the MS. a part of 78, and after the figure 78 there is 79. I do not think that anything has been dropped out. The second half of Verse 84 is left out, because it is so mutilated in the MS. that no sense comes out of it. The remark in Verse 93 that the servants of Sarasvatī sent Utsāhapaṇḍita, is probably to be interpreted as meaning that this man was among Jayasiṁha's ambassadors, and that he was sent home. For, according to the *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXI, 135, Utsāha was already present at Devasūri's and Kumudacandra's dispute, in Vikrama year 1181 as a *pārṣades'vara*. Therefore he could not have come to Aṇhilvāḍ at this time, which is much later.

32. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 144-146, pp. 147-148; at the end of the narrative Merutuṅga gives the first verse of the *Pras'asti*. Compare also *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 41-42.

33. For the restoration of the 35 verses which glorify the first seven Caulukya kings, I have used, in addition to A. Weber's information in the *Katalog der Berliner Sanskrit-und Prakrit-Handschriften*, vol. II, 1st section, pp. 211, 220-21, 230-31, 235, 242-43, the information in Peterson's *Third Report* and in Pischel's edition of the *Prakrit-Grammatik*, I, pp. V, II, p. 57, 98-99, 129, as well as a Collation of the Bombay MSS. for the first 28 verses, which my friend Kielhorn kindly left with me. The variants of them, mostly very valuable, are designated "K".

पाद १ (आर्या वृत्तः) ।

हरिरिव बलिबन्धकरस्त्रिशक्तियुक्तः पिनाकपाणिरिव ।
कमलाश्रयश्च विधिरिव जयति श्रीमूलराजनृपः ॥ १ ॥

पाद २ (आर्या) ।

पूर्वभवदारागोपीहरणस्मरणादिव ज्वलितमन्युः ।
श्रीमूलराजपुरुषोत्तमोवधीद् दुर्मदाभीरान् ॥ २ ॥

पाद ३ (अनुष्टुभ्) ।

चक्रे श्रीमूलराजेन नवः कोपि यशोर्णवः ।
परकीर्तिस्रवन्तीनां न प्रवेशमदत्त यः ॥ ३ ॥

पाद ४ (वसन्ततिलका) ।

सोत्कण्ठमङ्गलगनैः कचकर्षणैश्च
वक्त्राब्जचुम्बननखक्षतकर्मभिश्च ।
श्रीमूलराजहतभूपतिभिर्विलेसुः
संख्ये च कोपि च शिवाश्च सुरस्त्रियश्च ॥ ४ ॥

पाद ५ (अनुष्टुभ्) ।

मावृड् जातेति हे भूपा मा स्म त्यजत काननम् ।
हरिः शेतेत्र नन्वेष मूलराजमहापतिः ॥ ५ ॥

पाद ६ (अनुष्टुभ्) ।

मूलार्कः श्रूयते शास्त्रे सर्वाकल्याणकारणम्[1] ।
अधूना मूलराजस्तु चित्रं लोकेषु गीयते ॥ ६ ॥

पाद ७ (अनुष्टुभ्) ।

मूलराजासिधारायां निमग्ने ये महीभुजः ।
उन्मज्जन्तो[2] विलोक्यन्ते स्वर्गगङ्गाजलेषु ते ॥ ७ ॥

पाद ८ (उपजाति) ।

[3] श्रीमूलराजक्षितिपस्य बाहु-
र्बिभर्ति पूर्वाचलशृङ्गशोभाम् ।
संकोचयन् वैरिमुखाम्बुजानि
यस्मिन्नयं स्फूर्जति चन्द्रहासैः ॥ ८ ॥

पाद ९ (अनुष्टुभ्) ।

असंरब्धा अपि चिरं दुस्सहा वैरिभूभृतां ।
चण्डाश्चामुण्डराजस्य प्रतापशिखिनः कणाः ॥ ९ ॥

पाद १० (अनुष्टुभ्) ।

श्रीमद्वल्लभराजस्य प्रतापः कोपि दुस्सहः ।
प्रसरन् वैरिभूपेषु दीर्घनिद्रामकल्पयत् ॥ १० ॥

पाद ११ (अनुष्टुभ्) ।

श्रीदुर्लभेशद्युमणेः पादास्तुष्टुविरे[2] न कैः ।
लुलद्भिर्मेदिनीपालैर्वालखिल्यैरिवाग्रतः ॥ ११ ॥

पाद १२ (अनुष्टुभ्) ।

प्रतापतपनः कोपि मौलराजेर्नवोभवत्[4] ।
रिपुस्त्रीमुखपद्मानां न सेहे यः किल श्रियम् ॥ १२ ॥

पाद १३ (अनुष्टुभ्) ।

कुर्वन् कुन्तलशैथिल्यं मध्यदेशं निपीडयन् ।
अङ्गेषु विलसन् भूमेर्भर्ताभूद् भीमभूपतिः ॥ १३ ॥

पाद १४ (अनुष्टुभ्) ।

श्रीभीमपृतनोत्खातरजोभिर्वैरिभूभुजाम्[1] ।
अहो चित्रमवर्धन्त ललाटे जलबिन्दवः ॥ १४ ॥

पाद १५ (अनुष्टुभ्) ।

कर्णं च सिन्धुराजं च निर्जित्य युधि दुर्जयम् ।
श्रीभीमेनाधुना चक्रे महाभारतमन्यथा ॥ १५ ॥

पाद १६ (उपजाति) ।

दुर्योधनोर्वीपतिजैत्रबाहु-
र्गृहीतचेदीशकरोवतीर्णः ।

---

१. सर्वक° MSS.
२. So according to K.
३. Probably the last Pāda stood originally after the first one.
४. So according to the MS. of Elph. Coll. (K.).

अनुग्रहीतुम् पुनरिन्दुवंशं
श्रीभीमदेवः किल भीम एव ॥१६ ॥

पाद १७ (आर्या) ।

अगणितपञ्चेषुबलः पुरुषोत्तमचित्तविस्मयं[1] जनयन् ।
रामोल्लासनमूर्तिः श्रीकर्णः कर्ण इव जयति ॥ १७ ॥

पाद १८ (अनुष्टुभ्) ।

अकृत्वासननिर्बन्धमभित्त्वा पावनीं गतिम् ।
सिद्धराजः परपुरप्रवेशवशितां[1] ययौ ॥ १८ ॥

पाद १९ (अनुष्टुभ्) ।

मात्रयाप्यधिकं[1] कंचिन्न सहन्ते जिगीषवः[1] ।
इतीव त्वं धरानाथ धारानाथमपाकृथाः ॥ १९ ॥

पाद २० (शार्दूलविक्रीडित) ।

क्षुण्णाः क्षोणिभृतामनेककटका भग्नाथ धारा ततः
कुण्ठः सिद्धपतेः कृपाण इति रे मा मंसत क्षत्रियाः ।
आरूढप्रबलप्रतापदहनः संप्राप्तधारश्चिरात्
पीत्वा मालवयोषिदश्रुसलिलं हन्तायथेधिप्यते ॥ २० ॥

पाद २१ (उपजाति) ।

श्रीविक्रमादित्यनरेश्वरस्य
त्वया न किं विप्रकृतं[1] नरेन्द्र ।
यशांस्यहार्षीः प्रथमं समन्तात् ।
क्षणादभाङ्क्षीरथ राजधानीम् ॥ २१ ॥

पाद २२ (शिखरिणी) ।

मृडित्वा दोःकण्डूं समरभुवि वैरिक्षितिभुजां
भुजादण्डे दद्रुः कति न नवखण्डी वसुमतीम् ।
यदेवं साम्राज्ये विजयिनि वितृष्णेव मनसा
यशो योगीशानां पिबसि नृप तत्कस्य सदृशम् ॥ २२ ॥

पाद २३ (शिखरिणी) ।

जयस्तम्भान् सीमान्यधिजलधिवेलं निहितवान् ।
वितानैर्ब्रह्माण्डं शुचिगुणगरिष्ठैः पिहितवान् ।
यशस्तेजोरूपैरलिपत जगन्त्यर्धघुसृणैः
कुतो यात्रानन्दो विरमति न किं सिद्धनृपतिः ॥ २३ ॥

पाद २४ (see above Note 24) ।

पाद २५ (अनुष्टुभ्) ।

लब्धलक्षा विपक्षेषु विलक्षास्त्वयि मार्गणाः ।
तथापि तव सिद्धेन्द्र दातेत्युत्कंधरं यशः ॥ २५ ॥

पाद २६ (वसन्ततिलका) ।

उत्साहसाहसवता भवता नरेन्द्र
धाराव्रतं किमपि तद्विषमं सिषेवे ।
यस्मात्फलं न खलु मालवमात्रमेव
श्रीपर्वतोपि तव कन्दुककेलिपात्रम् ॥ २६ ॥

---

१. Cf. according to K.

पाद २७ (मालिनी) ।

अयमवनिपतीन्दो मालवेन्द्रावरोध-
स्तनकलशपविन्नं पल्लवर्णी लुनातु ।
कथमखिलमहीभृन्मौलिमाणिक्यभेदे
घटयति पटिमानं भग्नधारस्तवासिः ॥ २७ ॥

पाद २८ (मालिनी) ।

क्षितिधर भवदीयः क्षीरधारावलक्षै
रिपुविजययशोभिः श्वेत एवासिदण्डः ।
किमुत कवलितैस्तैः कज्जलैर्मालवीनां
परिणतमहिमानं कालिमानं तनोति ॥ २८ ॥

पाद २९ (शार्दूलविक्रीडित) ।

यद् दोर्मण्डलकुण्डलीकृतधनुर्दण्डेन सिद्धाधिप
क्रीतं वैरिकुलात्त्वया किल दलत्कुन्दावदातं यशः ।
भ्रान्त्वा त्रीणि जगन्ति खेदविवशं तन् मालवीनां व्यधाद्
आपाण्डौ स्तनमण्डले च धवले गण्डस्थलेवस्थितिम् ॥ २९ ॥

पाद ३० (उपेन्द्रवज्रा) ।

द्विषत्पुरक्षोदविनोदहेतोर्-
भवादवामस्य भवद्भुजस्य ।
अयं विशेषो भुवनैकवीर
परं न यत् काममपाकरोति ॥ ३० ॥

पाद ३१ (शार्दूलविक्रीडित) ।

ऊर्ध्वं स्वर्गनिकेतनादपि तले पातालमूलादपि
त्वत्कीर्तिर्भ्रमति क्षितीश्वरमणे पारे पयोधेरपि ।
तेनास्याः प्रमदास्वभावसुलभैरुच्चावचैश्चापलैस्
ते वाचंयमवृत्तयोपि मुनयो मौनव्रतं त्याजितः ॥ ३१ ॥

पाद ३२ (वसन्ततिलका) ।

आसीद्विशांपतिरमुद्रचतुःसमुद्र-
मुद्राङ्कितक्षितिभरक्षमबाहुदण्डः ।
श्रीमूलराज इति दुर्धरवैरिकुम्भि-
कण्ठीरवः शुचिचुलुक्यकुलावतंसः ॥ ३२ ॥
तस्यान्वये समजनि प्रबलप्रताप-
तिग्मद्युतिः क्षीतिपतिर्जयसिंहदेवः ।
येन स्ववंशसवितर्यपरं सुधांशौ
श्रीसिद्धराज इति नाम निजं व्यलेखि ॥ ३३ ॥
सम्यग् निषेव्य चतुरश्चतुरोप्युपायान्
जित्वोपभुज्य च भुवं चतुरब्धिकाञ्चिम् ।
विद्याचतुष्टयविनीतमतिर्जितात्मा
काष्ठामवाप पुरुषार्थचतुष्टये यः ॥ ३४ ॥
तेनातिविस्तृतदुरागमविप्रकीर्ण-
शब्दानुशासनसमूहकदर्थितेन ।
अभ्यर्थितो निरवमं विधिवद् व्यधत्त
शब्दानुशासनमिदं मुनिहेमचन्द्रः ॥ ३५ ॥

TRANSLATION:

1. The King, S'ri Mūlarāja, is victorious, who, establishing the oblation, is like Hari, who chained Bali (बलिबन्धकर)—who, endowed with three (royal) powers (शक्ति), is like the Bearer of Pināka accompanied by (the goddess) Tris'akti,—who, the refuge of Kamalā, is like Brahman whose Throne is lotus (*Kamala*).

Note: The three powers of the king originate from his majesty, energy and incantation. As regards the goddess *Tris'akti*, see Aufrecht. *Oxf. Lat.* p. 59. The third simile used in the verse is already found in Mūlarāja's gift of land, see *Indian Antiquary*, vol. VI, p. 191.

2. Burnt with anger as if through remembering the abduction of the *Gopīs*, his wives in an earlier life, S'rī Mūlarāja, (an incarnation of) Puruṣottama, killed the haughty Ābhīras.

Note: Mūlarāja killed, as is described in the *Dvyās'raya* (*Indian Antiquary*, vol. IV, pp. 74–77), Grāharipu, the Ābhira king of Sorath, who was alleged to be an incarnation of Narakāsura. The latter had stolen a lot of shepherdesses whom Kṛṣṇa released and married; see H. H. Wilsonl *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, vol. V, pp. 87–92; 104 (ed. F. E. Hall).

3. S'rī Mūlarāja has created from his fame a new type of an ocean which prohibits entry to the rivers of renown of his enemies.

4. As the jackals entertained themselves on the battlefield with the princes killed by S'rī Mūlarāja, even so did the Apsarases in heaven through passionate physical embraces, through hair-pulling, through kissing the lotus-face, (and) through inflicting wounds by nails.

Note: The last words describe, in relation to the Apsarases, the *bāhya sambhoga* as presented n the *Kāmas'āstra*.

5. Do not leave the forest, o princes, thinking: "the rainy season has set in!" Does not is here a lion—this great king Mūlarāja ?

Note: The princes who, defeated by Mūlarāja, had fled into the forest, might think that the danger was over on account of the impossibility of military operations during the rainy season, They were, however, to realise that Mūlarāja's lion-like energy would enable him to find them out.

6. It is heard in the S'āstra that the *Mūla*-sun is the root of evil. And yet what a wonder that now the *Mūla*-king is praised in the three worlds !

Note: The conjunction of the sun with the Mūla spells destruction, as surely this moon-house, whose protecting deity is Nirṛti, works only evil.

7. The princes, who are drowned in the water of Mūlarāja's swords, are seen emerging in the floods of the heavenly Gaṅgā.

8. The arm of S'rī Mūlarāja, on which this sword sparkles, possesses the beauty of the peak of the eastern mountain, on which the moonlight shines. It deforms the face of the enemies, (as this deforms) the day-lotuses.

9. The grim sparks of the fire of the strength of the king Cāmuṇḍa are, although not handled for a long time, still unbearable to enemy-princes.

Note: I think this means: even though Cāmuṇḍa has been dead for a long time the memory of his power is still painful to his enemies.

10. An unbearable heat (of power) was that of the king S'rīmad Vallabha; when it attacked the enemy-kings, it caused (them) a long sleep (of death).

11. who among the lords of the earth, like the *Vālakhilyas*, has not praised the feet of the sun-like king Durlabha, while vallowing (?) before the latter ?

Note: The kings are compared to the *Vālakhilyas* in order to suggest that they, like the latter, are as dwarfs compared with Durlabha. The conjugation of *lul-* according to the sixth class does not agree with the rule given by Pāṇini. In Hemacandra's *Dhātupārāyaṇa* also, the verb is not found amongst those of the sixth class. *Luladbhiḥ* is probably either a scribal error for *luṭhadbhiḥ*, or else Hemacandra has made himself guilty of a Prakriticism.

12. Of a novel type was the sun of majesty of Mūlarāja's offspring, for it does not tolerate the beauty of the day-lotuses, (viz.) the faces of the women of his enemies.

Note: Bhima I is probably meant by the offspring of Mūlarāja.

13. King Bhīma became the husband of the earth as in making the Kuntal empire loose, he loosened her hair-locks *(kuntala)*; as in suppressing the Madhyades'a he pressed the middle portion *(madhyades'a)* of her body, (and) as in sporting in the land of Aṅgas he enjoyed her body *(aṅga)*.

Note: These victories of king Bhīma are not mentioned in the *Dvyās'rayakāvya*; hence they may be poetic fictions invented for the sake of introducing figures of speech.

14. The dust which the army of S'rī Bhīma raised, increased the water-drops on the foreheads of the enemy kings: o what a wonder!

15. S'rī Bhīma has now recast the Mahābhārata inasmuch as he has won Karṇa and (also) Sindhurāja who was hard to be conquered in a battle.

Note: According to the *Dvyās'ryakāvya*, Bhîma I defeated Karṇa, the king of Cedi or Dāhala, and Hammuka, the prince of Sindh: *Indian Antiquary*, vol. IV, pp. 114, 232. Bhīma of the epic often conquered Karṇa: *Mahābhārata* VII, 131; 133: 139. However the latter was killed by Arjuna: *Mahābhārata* VIII, 91. The epic Sindhu prince Jayadratha also was killed by Arjuna: *Mahābhārata* VII, 146.

16. S'rī Bhīmadeva, whose arm conquered the kings who were hard to be fought against **(दुर्योधनोर्वीपति)**, and who took tribute **(कर)** from the Cedi prince, is indeed the Bhīma, whose arm, conquered Duryodhana and who seized the hands **(कर)** of the Cedi prince and who has come down in order to favour again the Moon race.

Note: The Caulukyas or Solaṅkīs of Aṇhilvāḍ belonged to the Moon race: see below verse 33 and the *Dvyās'rayakāvya*, *passim*, and the Pāṇḍavas were also the descendents of Pūne.

17. Victorious is S'rī Karṇa who did not mind the strength of the 'god with the five arrows', who generated wonder in the minds of best men, whose form possessed bright splendour and who, therefore, is like Karṇa who did not mind the strong (heroes) with five arrows, who generated wonder in the heart of Puruṣottama, whose form possessed lovely splendour.

Note: In the *Ratnamālā* (*Jour. Bo. Br. R. A. S.*, vol. IX, p. 37) we read: "His (Bhīma's) son Karṇa was of fair complexion." The beauty of the form of the epic Karṇa is described in the *Mahābhārata*, VIII, 91, 60-61. Puruṣottama or Kṛṣṇa was Arjuna's charioteer in the fight against Karṇa. "The five strong-of-the-arrow" are the five sons of Pāṇḍu. The assertion that king Karṇa despised the power of the Love-god is probably an unjustified piece of flattery. For in the *Ratnamālā*, *loc. cit.*, we read of him: "He was lustful."

18. (a) Without making a long stop in a camp, without interrupting the wind-like speed of the march, Siddharāja attained the capacity to enter the city of the enemy.

(b) Without much perseverence in the ascetic poistures, without interrupting the movement of respiration, Siddharāja attained the power of entering the body of other beings.

Note: The verse has a double meaning. On the one hand, Siddharāja is described as a fortunate conquerer with particular reference to the conquest of Ujjain: *Indian Antiquary*, vol. IV, p. 266. He is complimented, on the other hand, upon having attained one of the goals of Yoga without following the ascetic practices. The *parapurapraves'a* is described in detail by Hemacandra in the *Yogas'āstra* V, 264-272. The second meaning of *abhittvā pāvanīm gatim* is *prāṇāyāmān akṛtvā*.

19. Those-aiming-at-victory do not tolerate any one who is superior to them even by the length of a vowel. It is therefore that thou, o lord of the earth (*dharā*), hast driven away the lord of Dhārā.

Note: The lord of Dhārā is Yas'ovarman whom Siddharāja took captive.

20. O warriors! Do not think that the sword of the king Siddha is now blunt because it has killed many armies of the (enemy) kings and consequently Dhārā (both the city and the edge of the sword) is broken. Ah, it will still be stronger as on it a mighty fire of strength is kindled, as it has won Dhārā (both the city and the edge) after it had drunk for long the water of tears of the Mālava women.

Note: The second half of the verse affirms that the sword is forged over again.

21. How much harm hast thou not, o lord of men, wrought to the king Vikramāditya? First thou hast robbed him of his fame; then thou hast destroyed his capital in a moment.

Note: Jayasiṁha robbed Vikramāditya's fame, as he was still more generous than the famous king of Ujjain; compare below verse 25.

22. How many have not held in a strong arm the earth having nine parts, after they have driven away the tickling of the might of the hostile ruler on the battlefield? That thou, o king enjoyest the fame of the lords among the ascetics on account of thy mind free from greed even though possessing so rich an empire, to whom is this similar?

Note: The verse confirms the account of the *Prabandhas* about Jayasiṁha's philosophical studies.

23. Victory-pillars he has erected on his frontiers, on the shore of the ocean; he has covered "Brahman's Egg" with a canopy which is very valuable because of the brilliant texture—(of his) brilliant virtues; he has embalmed the worlds with excellant saffron in the form of his fame; he has celebrated a pilgrimage-feast; why does the king Siddha not yet rest?

Note: Although *yātrā* is a word with two meanings, it can only mean "pilgrimage" here. For there has already been mention of Jayasiṁha's warlike undertakings. Besides these, the author wishes to emphasize the piety of the king, just as in the previous verse. As regards the point as to which pilgrimage is meant, see above page 18.

24. See above, page 13 of the text.

25. With the enemies the *mārgaṇas* attain their aim, with thee they miss it. Notwithstanding this, thy fame of generosity rises high above the napes, o king Siddha.

Note: *mārgaṇa* means both 'a begger' and an 'arrow'.

26. Thou, o king, possessor of zeal and enterprize, hast completed a difficult venture, the vow of taking *dhārā*, through which not only Mālavā was thy reward but also S'rīparvata as toy.

Note: *Dhārāvrata* is put instead of the more usual *asidhārāvrata* for the sake of a word-play on the name of the town *Dhārā*; nothing is said in the *Prabandhas* or in the *Dvyās'raya* about the conquest of a hill fortress, S'rīparvata. Perhaps the word is not meant to be read as a proper name but means only "a hill of riches".

27. This sword of thine, Moon amongst princes, may destroy the face-decoration, which has been sanctified through the round breasts of the wives of the Mālava-king! How can it possess

sharpness as *Dhārā* (the City and the edge) is destroyed by the cracking of the carbuncle-stone on the heads of all princes ?

28. Lord of earth, is thy strong sword white from the fame of victory, shining like a milk-stream, over enemies ? Or is it coloured deep-black from the swallowed eye-anointment of the Mālava-women ?

29. With the bow bent in a ring by an encompassing arm, thou winnest, king Siddha, thy fame which shines white like the blooming Jasmine;—that rested itself, worn out from wondering through the three worlds, on the pale round breasts of the Mālava-women and on their pale cheeks.

Note: For the last part of the verse, Compare *Navasāhasāṅkacarita* XI, 100 where, too, the paleness of the women caused by care and anxiety is identified with the fame of the conquerer. See also Pischel, *Hem. Prak. Gram.*, vol. II, p. 57.

30. Between Bhava, who caused joy by destroying the three fortified cities of his enemies (the Asuras) and thy right hand, who caused joy by destroying the fortified cities of (thy) enemies, the difference is, o only hero of the world, that this one does not refuse (to grant even) strange wishes (*paraṁ kāmaṁ nāpakaroti*), while that one destroyed the greatest god of love (*paraṁ kāmaṁ apākaroti*).

Note: Compare Pischel, *loc. cit.*, p. 99.

31. Eeven above the heavenly palaces, even under the undermost ground of the hell, even beyond the ocean, thy fame wanders, o Jewel among the princes. Therefore, her various frivolities which are common to the feminine nature, has enticed the ascetics, even the restrainers of speech, to break the vow of silence.

Note: Cf. Pischel, *loc. cit.*, p. 119, who erroneously divides *te nāsyāḥ* in the text, missing thereby the meaning of the second half of the verse. Weber has rightly given *ten'āsyāḥ*, i. e. *tena asyāḥ* (scil. *kīrteḥ*).

32. It was once a prince among men, named S'rī Mūlarāja, a lion for the irresistible enemy-elephants, an ornament of the pure Caulukya-race, whose strong arm was capable to carry the burden of the earth bounded by the four unmeasurable oceans.

Note: Or, "a lion for (those) elephants, his enemies hard to be conquered."

33. In his race was born the king Jayasiṁhadeva, a sun of the most powerful majesty, who inscribed his other name S'rī-Siddharāja in the moon—the procreator of his race.

Note: The Caulukyas belong to the moon-race; see above verse 16. The spots in the moon are often explained by poets as *pras'astis* of their patrons.

34. He, the clever one, employed all the four means (of politics); he conquered and enjoyed (the possession) of the earth encircled by the four oceans; through (the study of) four sciences he formed his understanding; he mastered his own self. In this way he attained the aim through the four kinds of endeavours of men.

Note: As regards the four branches of science which Jayasiṁha studied, compare *Manu* VII, 43.

35. Requested by him, who was tortured by the mass of the sciences of words which were too long, too difficult to be studied and scattered (all over the world), the monk Hemacandra composed this science of words according to the rules, that is not the last (in rank).

Note: *Durāgama*: 'difficult to be studied' can also mean "teaching what is wrong." "According to the rules", that is, in such a way that it consisted, with the *Uṇādisūtra*, the *Gaṇapātha*, the *Dhātupāṭha*, the *Liṅgānus'āsana*, of five parts, and formed a *pañcāṅgaṁ vyākaraṇaṁ*, as required by usage.

34. About Hemacandra's Grammar, see Kielhorn, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. II, p. 18; Pischel's remarks in the Preface to his edition of the Adhyāya VIII; and the description of the MSS. in A. Weber's *Katalog der Sanskrit-und-Prakrit-Handschriften der Berliner Bibliothek;* and about the allusions to the historical events of Jayasiṁha's time in the examples of the Commentary, see Kielhorn, *Indian Antiquary*, vol. VII, p. 267. Hemacandra's Commentary written by himself exists in two versions, the *Bṛhatī* and the *Laghu Vṛtti.* Both are authentic. Besides the fact that both commentaries contain the examples and the *Pras'asti,* the following may also be given as a proof of their authenticity. Devendra, a pupil of Hemacandra's pupil Udayacandra, wrote, possibly still during Hemacandra's lifetime, but certainly before 1214 A. D., a Commentary to the *Bṛhatī Vṛtti* under the name *Katicidduryapadavyākhyā.* There are MSS. of this work in Berlin, see Weber, *loc. cit.*, p. 237, cf. 233, 240. A palm-leaf MS. of the same, which is in the *Bṛhajjñānakoṣa* in Jesalmir, was written about forty years after Hemacandra's death. According to my notes, the begining reads as follows:—

॥ अर्हं ॥ प्रणम्य केवलालोकावलोकितजगत्त्रयम् ।
जिनेशं श्रीसिद्धहेमचन्द्रशब्दानुशासने ॥ १ ॥
शब्दविद्याविदां वन्द्योदयचन्द्रोपदेशतः ।
न्यासतः कतिचिद्दुर्गपदव्याख्याभिधीयते ॥ २ ॥

and the end, fol. 186: व्याकरणचतुष्कावचूर्णिकायां षष्ठः पादः समाप्तः । प्रथमपुस्तिका प्रमाणीकृता ॥ संवत् १२७१ वर्षे कार्त्तिक शुदि षष्ठ्यां शुक्रे श्रीनरचन्द्रसूरीणां आदेशन प°. The date corresponds to the 10th October, 1214, a Friday.

As regards the *Laghu Vṛtti,* the oldest MS. preserved in the Cambay Library, was written during Hemacandra's lifetime, V. S. 1224, *bhādrapade sudi 3 budhe,* see Peterson, *First Report,* App., pp. 70–71. In the MSS. used by Pischel for his edition of the Prakrit-Grammar, the *Loghu Vṛtti* bears the title *Prakās'ikā,* which is otherwise often missing.

The *Ḍhuṇḍhikā,* or etymological explanation of the words occurring in the Commentary, was not written by Hemacandra, in spite of the fact that it is sometimes ascribed to him in the Colophon of the Pādas. The *Ḍhuṇḍhikā* to the Sanskrit-Grammar (Weber, *loc. cit.* p. 238) originated with Vinayacandra; that to the Prakrit-Grammar is by Udayasaubhāgyagaṇi. (*Deccan College Collection* 1873/74, No. 276). The latter also contains a Sanskrit translation of all the Prakrit verses which are quoted in the Commentary.

35. See Kielhorn's Essays in the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, loc. cit.* and in the *Indian Antiquary,* vol. XV, pp. 181f., cf. also O. Franke, *Liṅgānus'āsana,* p. XIV. As regards the Grammar of Buddhisāgara, which Hemacandra used, I may add that this work exists. There is a palm-leaf MS. of it, written in the 13th century, in the *Brihajjñānakoṣa* in Jesalmir. According to the verse of the *Prabhāvakacaritra,* quoted by Klatt, *Indian Antiquary,* vol. XI, p. 248, Note 20, the work contains eight thousand *Granthas.* Buddhisāgara lived at the beginning of the 11th century, as is shown by the reports given by Klatt, *loc. cit.*, from the *Paṭṭāvali* of *Khartara-gaccha.* Therefore he is the oldest known grammarian of the S'vetāmbaras.

36. *Indian Antiquary,* vol. XV, p. 32.

37. Kielhorn, *Indian Antiquary, loc. cit.*; Weber, *Katalog der Berliner Sanskrit-und-Prakrit-Handschriften,* vol. II, 1st section, p. 254, where verse 5 of the *Pras'asti* and the colophon read as follows:—

षट्तर्ककर्कशमतिः कविचक्रवर्ती
शब्दानुशासनमहाम्बुधिपारदृष्टा ।
शिष्याम्बुजप्रकरज[जृ]म्भनचित्रभानुः
कक्कल एव सुकृती जयति चिरायाम् ॥ ५ ॥

इति पण्डितपुण्डरीकेन श्रीकक्कलोपदेशेन तत्त्वप्रकाशिका वृत्तिः श्रीदेवसूरिपादपद्मोपजीविना गुणचन्द्रेण स्वपरोपकारार्थं श्रीहेमचन्द्रव्याकरणाभिप्रायेण प्राणायि ॥

The correction in the third Pāda is by Weber. As regards the name Kākala-Kakkala-Kākalla, compare that of the last Rāṣṭrakūṭa-king of Mānyakheṭa, who, in the inscriptions, is called Karka, Kakka, Kakkaṛa or Kakkala, see Fleet, *The Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts*, p. 38. It may further by mentioned that, according to the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 169, Kākala was present at Devasūri's disputation and solved, by a reference from S'ākaṭāyana's Grammar, the question of whether the form *koṭī* for *koṭi* would be correct. The *Prabhāvakacaritra* attributes the same feat to Utsāhapaṇḍita.

38. See *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*, verse 1 (ed. Böhtlingk and Rieu); *Anekārthakoṣa* I, 1 (Benares Edition); *Chandonus'āsana*; Weber *Catalogue*, vol. II, p. 268. Neither in the *Chandonus'āsana* nor in the *Alaṁkāracūdāmaṇi* are we told that the *Koṣas* were completed. They only speak of the *S'abdānus'āsana*, just as in the Introduction to the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*. If one does not wish to assume that Hemacandra wrote the *Koṣas* and the Rhetorics at the same time, then it is probable that he regarded the *Koṣas* as belonging to the Etymology, and therefore did not think it necessary to make special mention of them. This is suggested also by the *Prabhāvakacaritra*. The *S'abdānus'āsana* is mentioned in the *Alaṁkāracūdāmaṇi* I, 2:

शब्दानुशासनेस्माभिः साध्व्यो वाचो विवेचिताः ।
तासामिदानीं काव्यत्वं यथावदनुशिष्यते ॥ २ ॥

In the Commentary written by himself, Hemacandra remarks:

······अनेन शब्दानुशासनकाव्यानुशासनयोरेककर्तृत्वम् चाह । अत एव हि प्रायोगिकमन्यैरिव नारभ्यते ।

To the "others" there belongs, for instance, Vāmana who enumerates the ungrammatical forms prevalent among the poets.

39. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 148:

तथा च सिद्धराजदिग्विजयवर्णने द्व्याश्रयनामा ग्रन्थः कृतः ।

For the *Dvyās'raya*, I have before me, besides the oft-quoted, very good extract of K. Forbes in the 4th vol. of *Indian Antiquary*,—a MS. of the Vienna University Library, which contains the first ten *Sargas* besides the Commentary of Abhayatilaka.

40. *Jour. Bo. Br. R. A. Sec.*, vol. IX., p. 37.

41. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 130–140 (129–139); *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 155–156. About Rāmacandra, see page 50. Before this story there is, in the *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 117–129 a story of a bard, who praised Hemacandra in an *Apabhraṁs'a*-verse and received a large reward for it. Merutuṅga, *Prab. Cint.* pp. 235–236, relates something similar, which is supposed to have happened during Kumārapala's reign.

42. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 141–173 (140–172).

43. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 174–183 (173–182); *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* p. 205. Purohita Āmiga is a historical personage and is mentioned by his grandson Somes'vara in the *Surathotsava*, Bhāṇḍarkar, *Report on the Search etc.* 1883/4, p. 20. It is not said there which king he served. However, the probability is that he lived under Kumārapāla.

Hemarandra's simile was, according to the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, contained in the following verse:-

सिंहो बली हरिणसूकरमांसभोजी
संवत्सरेण रतिमेति किलैकवारम् ।

गारापतः खलशिलाकणभोजनोपि
कामी भवत्यनुदिनं वद कोत्र हेतुः ॥

Merutuṅga has, in the first Pāda, the variant *dviradasūkara*, in the second, *ratam kilaikavelam*. A still more varying reading is to be found in Böhtlingk's *Indischen Sprüchen* No. 7044. To my knowledge there is no incontestable proof that the verse belongs to Hemacandra.

44. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 184–380. The verse which Devabodhi is supposed to have composed in honour of Hemacandra reads:-

पातु वो हेमगोपालः कम्बलं दण्डमुद्वहन् ।
षड्दर्शनपशुग्रामं चारयञ् जैनगोचरे ॥

The same also occurs in the *Prabandhacintāmani*, p. 227, where the first half is attributed to a poet Vis'ves'vara from Benares, and the second half to King Kumārapāla. As regards Devabodhi, see page 39 and Note 78.

45. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 311–355. Hemacandra's worship of Ambikā is orthodox, as this is worshipped as S'āsanadevatā by all Jainas. The verses which Hemacandra is supposed to have addressed to S'iva, are given below, Note 61.

46. *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 55–57.

47. About the pilgrimage, see *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 160–161; about the story of Sajjana, *ibid.* pp. 159–160; the verse in honour of S'iva is to be found, *ibid.* p. 213.

48. *Indian Antiquary*, vol. IV, p. 267.

49. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 156–157:

आयुक्तः प्राणदो लोके वियुक्तो मुनिवल्लभः ।
संयुक्तो सर्वथानिष्टः केवली स्त्रीषु वल्लभः ॥

50. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 173–175.

51. *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 37–38. The narrative has here the usual form of the Jaina-parables. The place of the action is S'aṅkhapura, the merchant is called S'aṅkha, and his wife Yas'omatī. There is no talk of a courtesan, but the merchant takes a second wife, because he no longer loves the first one. There are also some Sanskrit and Prakrit verses woven in.

53. This second Hemacandra, who is often confused with Guru of Kumārapāla, was the pupil of Abhayadeva, who founded the line of the Maladhārin, and belonged to the Pras'navāhanakula, Madhyamas'ākhā and the Harṣapurīya Gaccha. Sometimes this Hemacandra is therefore called simply Maladhāri-Hemacandra. He wrote:-

(1) *Jīvasamāsa*, a Prakrit work with a Sanskrit Commentary, Peterson, *First Report*, App. I, p. 18 and Kielhorn, *Report of 1880/1881*, App., p. 93, No. 151. The Cambay MS. was written by the author himself in V. S. 1164. Dr. Peterson in his notes, *Report*, p. 63, attributed it erroneously to the grammarian Hemacandra and I, equally erroneously, agreed with this view in my criticism.

(2) *Bhavabhāvanā*, a Prakrit work with a Sanskrit Commentary, which was completed in V, S. 1170, see Peterson, *Third Report*, App. I, pp. 155–156, especially verses 6–11 of the *Pras'asti.*

(3) *Uvaesamālā*, a Prakrit work, Peterson, *First Report*, App. I. p. 91, to which there perhaps also belongs a Sanskrit Commentary written by the author himself, Peterson, *Third Report*, p. 176.

(4) *S'atakavṛtti Vineyahitā*, a Sanskrit Commentary on a Prakrit work of S'ivas'arma-Sūri.

(5) *Anuyogasūtraṭīkā*, Peterson, *Third Report*, App. I, pp. 36–37, Weber, *Katalog*, vol. II, 2nd section, p. 694.

(6) *S'iṣyahitā vṛttiḥ*, a Sanskrit Commentary on Jinabhadra's *Bhāṣya* to the *Āvas'yasūtra*, Weber, *loc. cit.*, p. 787.

It is to be noted that the Jainas themselves do not attribute the above-named works to the Guru of Kumārapāla, and that they therefore know quite well of the existence of two contemporaries of the same name. That Hemacandra, the pupil of Abhayadeva, went to Siddharāja's court, is mentioned by Devaprabha in verse 3 of the *Pras'asti* to his *Pāṇḍavacarita* (Peterson, *Third Report*, App. I, p. 133), where we read: "On his (Abhayadeva's) seat there appeared the celebrated Hemasūri, a moon amongst the best, whose speech-nectar the illustrious king Siddharāja drank." Between Devaprabha and Hemacandra there were, as the *Pras'asti* further tells us, three generations of teachers, and Devaprabha therefore probably had lived in the 13th century. A more distant member of the same school is Rājas'ekhara, author of the *Prabandhakoṣa*, who wrote at about the end of the 14th century (see above Note 3). In the *Pras'asti* to his Commentary to S'rīdhara's *Nyāyakandalī*, Peterson, *Third Report*, App. I, p. 274, he describes Hemacandra, Abhayadeva's pupil, as follows:-

(8) "Endowed with many virtues was the Sūri, named S'rī Hemacandra, author of one hundred thousand S'lokas, who won fame for the Nirgranthas."

(9) "He awakened Siddha, the husband of the earth, and caused (by him) all the temples of his own and of other kingdoms to be adorned with flagstaffs and golden knobs."

(10) "In consequence of his teaching, Prince Siddha had the command engraved, on copperplates, that all creatures were to be spared during eighty days in each year."

54. Peterson, *Third Report*, App. I, p. 95, verse 9 of the *Pras'asti* of the *Amamasvāmicarita*. The author, Muniratna, wrote his work in V. S. 1252 and was a pupil of Samudraghoṣa.

55. The forefathers of Kumārapāla are mentioned by Hemacandra in the *Dvyās'raya*, *Indian Antiquary*, *loc. cit.*, pp. 232, 235, 267, and we read in the first passage that *Kṣemarāja* renounced the throne voluntarily, as he cherished ascetic tendencies. The *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 354–355 gives a part of the genealogical table which agrees with that of the *Dvyās'raya*. We read there:-

इतः श्रीकर्णभूपालब[न्]धुः क्षे[क्ष]त्रशिरोमणिः ।
देवप्रसाद इत्यासीत् प्रासाद इव सम्पदाम् ॥ ३५४ ॥
तत्पुः[त्रः] श्र[श्री]त्रिभुवनपाल[:] पालितमं[स]द्व्रतः ।
कुमारपालस्तत्पुत्रो राज्यलक्षणलक्षितः ॥ ३५५ ॥

Merutuṅga, *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 191, diverges, as he gives the following order:-(1) Bhīma I, (2) Haripāla, (3) Tribhuvanapāla, (4) Kumārapāla. It is only in his work that one finds the report that Kumārpāla's ancestor was the son of a courtesan named Cauladevī. In spite of the fact that this statement originates with a later source, it may nevertheless be correct, as it explains in a simple manner the aversion of Jayasiṁha towards Kumārapāla. If Hemacandra says nothing about it, this has not much significance, as he could not reproach his patron with his illegitimate descent. Jinamaṇḍana, *Kumārapālacarita* p. 8, says that Bhīma's first wife (*vṛddhā*) Cakuladevī was the mother of Kṣemarāja, and that the latter renounced the throne for love of his younger brother. He gives the genealogical table, p. 43, exactly the same as Hemacandra, and he adds that Kumārapāla's mother was a Kās'mīri princess (*Kās'mīradevī*). The latter is more probable than the assumption of an anonymous historical fragment (Bhāṇḍārkar, *Report etc. 1883/4*, No. 11) that she was the sister of Jayasiṁha-Siddharāja. A marriage of this nature within the same family is not allowed with Rājputs, and does not occur. Jayashiṁha's enmity towards Kumārapāla gives Jinamaṇḍana, p. 58, reason to assert that the king had hoped still to obtain a son through S'iva's grace after having cleared Kumārapāla out of the way. Hemacandra, probably because he wrote as a court-poet, makes no mention of

Jayasiṁha's hatred towards Kumārapāla, in the *Dvyās'raya*. The story, too, of Kumārapāla's flight and wanderings only occurs in the *Prabhāvakācaritra*, in Merutuṅga and in later Prabandhakāras. However, there is, in favour of the correctness of this narrative, a verse of the *Moharāja-parājaya* (Kielhorn, *Report 1880/81*, p. 34), where we read: "To whom is this prince of the Gūrjaras, the banner of the Caulukya-race, not known, he *who through curiosity wandered alone through the whole world?*" etc. Here we have a distinct reference to Kumārapāla's wanderings. As Yas'aḥpāla wrote in Ajayapāla's reign immediately after Kumārapāla's death, his testimony has great value. Kumārapāla's coronation took place certainly in the Vikrama-year 1199, as the *Prabandhas* assert, as Hemacandra (see below, Note 66) gives a similar statement in the *Mahāvīracarita*. The oldest inscription of his reign is that of Maṅgrol-Maṅgalapura, which is dated in the year 1202, *Bhāvnagar Prācīn S'odhsaṁgraha*, pp. 1–10. The day of the event is, according to Merutuṅga's *Vicāras'reṇi*, Mārgas'ira sudi 4, but according to the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of the same author, p. 194, it is Kārttika vadi 2, Sunday under the Nakṣatra Hasta. Jinamaṇḍana, *Kumārapālacarita* pp. 58 and 83, names Mārgas'īrṣa sudi 4, Sunday.

56. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 356-417.

57. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 192–195.

58. *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 44–54. The sermon, adorned with many alleged quotations from the Brahmanical literature, is given in full.

59. *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 58–83. The meeting of Hemacandra and Udayana is described on pp. 66–70.

60. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 417–595. The extract is very much lengthened by the insertion of several, mostly irrelevant, tales. In his first speech to the king, 429–456, Vāgbhaṭa weaves in the story of the death of his father Udayana, who accompanied Kumārapāla's brother Kīrtipāla on a campaign against Navaghana, the king of Saurāṣṭra, and fell in battle. Then the last compaign against Arṇorāja, and the decisive battle are very fully described and the description is much lengthened by the story of an attack tried by Vikramasiṁha, the Paramāra king of Candrāvatī and Ābū against Kumārapāla. The passage refering to Hemacandra's call, and to the conversion of Kumārapāla is as follows:—

अन्येद्युर्वाग्भटामात्यं धर्मात्यन्तकवासनः ।
अपृच्छदार्हताचारोपदेष्टारं गुरुं नृपः ॥ ५८१ ॥
सूरे[:] श्रीहेयम[हेम]चन्द्रस्य गुणगौरवसौरभ[भं] ।
आख्यदख्याम[त] विद्यौघमध्यामो[ध्यात्म]प्रशमश्रियं ॥ ५८२ ॥
शीघ्रमाहूयतामुक्तो[क्ति] राज्ञा वाग्भटमन्त्रिणा ।
राजवेश्म[न्य]नीयन्त सूरयो बहुमानतः ॥ ५८३ ॥
अभ्युत्थाय महीशेन दत्तासंन्यु[सना उ]पाविशन् ।
राजाह शु[सु]गुरो धर्मं दिश जैनं तमोहरम् ॥ ५८४ ॥
अथ हंव[तं च] दयामूलमाचख्यौ स मुनीश्वरः ।
असत्यस्तेनताब्रह्मपरिग्रहविवर्जनम् ॥ ५८५ ॥
निशाभोजनमुक्तिश्च मांसाहारस्य हेयता ।
श्रुतिस्मृतिस्वसिद्धान्तनियामकशतै[र्] दृढा ॥ ५८६ ॥

उक्तं च योगशास्त्रे ॥ [प्रकाश ३, १८–२२].........
इत्यादिसर्वहेयानां परित्यागमुपादिशत् ।
तथेति थति[कृत्वा] जग्राह तेषां च नियमान्नृपः ॥ ५९२ ॥
श्रीचैत्यवन्दनस्तोत्र[त्रं] स्तुतिमुख्यमधीतवान् ।
वंदनवाक्षामणालोचप्रतिक्रमणकान्यपि(?) ॥ ५९३ ॥

प्रत्याख्यानानि सर्वाणि तथागा[गम] विचारिका[कां] ।
नित्यमशनमाधानू(?) पर्वस्वेकाशनं तथा ॥ ५९४ ॥
स्ता[स्तो]त्राचारप्रकारं चारात्रिकस्याप्यशिक्षते[त] ।
जैनं विधिं समभ्यस्य चिरश्रावकवद् बभो[भौ] ॥ ५९५ ॥

61. In the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 195–197, Kumārapāla's battles with his rebellious counsellors are described; on pp. 197–199 the campaign against Arṇorāja and the rewarding of his benefactors; on pp. 200–201 the adventures of the singer Sollāka; on pp. 201–203 the war against Mallikārjuna and his fall; on pp. 203–206 Hemacandra's introduction to Kumārapāla's court and the events immediately following it; on pp. 207–217 the building of the temple of S'iva-Somanātha, the pilgrimage to Devapattana and the conversion of the king. Udayana's account of Hemacandra's youth is pushed into the latter tale on pp. 207–211, see above page 7. The verses which Hemacandra is supposed to have composed in honour of S'iva, read on p. 213 as follows:—

यत्र तत्र समये यथा तथा
  योसि सोस्यभिधया यया तया ।
वीतदोषकलुषः स चेद् भवान्
  एक एव भगवन् नमोस्तु ते ॥ १ ॥
भवबीजाङ्कुरजनना रागाद्याः क्षयमुपागता यस्य ।
ब्रह्मा वा विष्णुर्वा महेश्वरो वा नमस्तस्मै ॥ २ ॥

They are the same as were composed, according to the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, when Hemacandra visited the place of pilgrimage, Devapattana, with Siddharāja. The question as to whether they are authentic, is difficult to decide. However, it is quite possible that, on some occasion or other, Hemacandra consented, in order to please one of his S'ivaite patrons, to sing in praise of S'iva in so curious a fashion, and with a double meaning.

62. *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 87–88:

अथ कर्णावत्याः श्रीहेमाचार्याः श्रीकुमारस्य राज्याप्तिं श्रुत्वा उदयनमन्त्रिकृतप्रवेशोत्सवाः पत्तने प्रापुः । पृष्टो मन्त्री । राजास्माकं स्मरति न वेति । मन्त्रिणोक्तम् । नेति । ततः कदाचित्सूरिभिरूचे । मन्त्रिन् त्वं भूपं ब्रूया रहः । अद्य त्वया नं. राज्ञा गृहे नैव सुसव्यम् (sic) रात्रौ सोपसर्गत्वात् । केनोक्तमिति पृच्छेत् तदात्याग्रहे मन्नाम वाच्यम् । ततो मन्त्रिणा तथोक्ते राज्ञा च तथा कृते निशि विद्युत्पातात्तस्मिन् गृहे दग्धे राज्ञ्यां च मृतायां चमत्कृतो राजा जगाद सादरम् । मन्त्रिन् कस्येदमनागतज्ञानं महत्परोपकारित्वं च । ततो राज्ञोतिनिर्बन्धे मन्त्रिणा श्रीगुरूणां आगमनमूचे । प्रमुदितो नृपस्तान् आकारयामास सदसि । सुरीन् दृष्ट्वासनादुत्थाय वन्दित्वा प्राञ्जलिरुवाच । भगवन् अहं निजास्यमपि दर्शयितुं नालं तत्रभवताम् । तदा च स्तम्भतीर्थे रक्षितो भाविराज्यसमयचिटिका चार्पिता । परमहं प्राप्तराज्योपि नस्मार्षं युष्माकं निष्कारणप्रथमोपकारिणाम् । कथंचनाप्यहं नानृणो भवामि । सूरिभिरूचे । कथमित्थं विकत्थसे त्वमात्मानं मुधा राजन् उपकारक्षणो यत्ते संप्रति समागतोस्ति । ततो राजाह । भगवन् पूर्वप्रतिश्रुतमिदं राज्यं गृहीत्वा मामनुगृहाण । ततः सूरिः प्रोवाच । राजन् निस्सङ्गानामस्माकं राज्येन[किम्] । चेद् भूपस्त्वं प्रत्युपचिकीरसि आत्मनीते(?) तदा जैनधर्मे धेहि निजं मनः । ततो राजाह । भवदुक्तं करिष्येहं सर्वमेव शनैः शनैः । कामयेहं परं सङ्गं निधेरिव तव प्रभो(:) ॥ अतो भवद्भिरिह प्रत्यहं समागम्यं प्रसद्य । एवमङ्गीकृत्य यथाप्रस्तावं च सभायामागत्य धर्ममर्मान्तराणि सूरिराख्यातवान् ॥

63. *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 88–137. It may also be mentioned that Jinamaṇḍana does not disdain the report of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* about Kumārapāla's 12 years' war with Arṇorāja and the defeat of the latter through the mercy of Ajitanātha. He inserts it later, on pp. 232 ff, without any connection.

64. J. Tod, *Travels in Western India*, p. 504. No. V.—The extract given there is quite unreliable. The partial translation by Forbes, *Journ. Bo. Br. R. A. Soc* vol. VIII, pp. 58–59, is better. An edition of the important inscriptions by Mr. Vajeshankar G. Ozhā appeared in *Wiener Zeitschr. f. die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. III, pp. 1. ff. The verse in question reads:–

एवं राज्यमनारतं विदधति श्रीवीरसिंहासने
श्रीमद्वीरकुमारपालनृपतौ त्रैलोक्यकल्पद्रुमे ।
गण्डो भावबृहस्पतिः स्मररिपोरुद्वीक्ष्य देवालयं
जीर्णं भूपतिमाह देवसदनं प्रोद्धर्तुमेतद्वचः ॥ ११ ॥

The date of the inscription, Valabhī-Saṁvat 850, cannot be translated with accuracy, as the day of the week and the month is not stated. However, it corresponds to V. S. 1225, and probably May or June 1169 A. D.

65. *Indian Antiquary*, vol. IV, pp. 267-269.

66. This important passage, to which Prof. H. H. Wilson, *Works*, vol. I, pp. 303 f. (ed. Rost), first called attention, occurs in the *Mahāvīracarita*, Sarga XII, 45-96. I am indebted to Dr. R. G. Bhāṇḍārkar for the following copy, which was prepared by S'āstrī Vāmanācārya Jhalkīkar from a MS. of the Deccan College Collection bought by me in 1874. The emendations in verses 45, 52, 53, 54, 62, 63. 68, 69, 74, 79, 85, 91 were suggested by the copyist.

अस्मि[स्म]न्निर्वाणतो वर्षशत्या[ता]न्यभय षोडश ।
नवषष्टिश्च यास्यन्ति यदा तत्र पुरे तदा ॥ ४५ ॥
कुमारपालभूपालश्चो[श्चौ]लुक्यकुलचन्द्रमाः ।
भविष्यति महाबाहुः प्रचण्डाखण्डशासनः ॥ ४६ ॥
स महात्मा धर्मदानयुद्धवीरः प्रजां निजाम् ।
ऋद्धिं नेष्यति परमां पितेव परिपालयन् ॥ ४७ ॥
ऋजुरप्यतिचतुरः शान्तोप्याज्ञादिवस्पतिः ।
क्षमावानप्यधृष्यश्च स चिरं क्ष्मामविष्यति ॥ ४८ ॥
स आत्मसदृशं लोकं धर्मनिष्ठं करिष्यति ।
विद्यापूर्णम्[र्णं] उपाध्याय इवान्तेवासिनं हितम् ॥ ४९ ॥
शरण्यः शरणेच्छूनां परनारीसहोदरः ।
प्राणेभ्योपि धनेभ्योपि स धर्मं बहु मंस्यते ॥ ५० ॥
पराक्रमेण धर्मेण दानेन दययाज्ञया ।
अन्यैश्च पुरुषगुणैः सोद्वितीयो भविष्यति ॥ ५१ ॥
स कौबेरीमातुरुष्व(ष्क)मैन्द्रीमात्रिदशापगम् ।
याम्यामाविन्ध्यमावार्धि[र्धिं] पश्चिमां साधयिष्यति ॥ ५२ ॥
अन्यदा वज्रशाखायां मुनिचन्द्रकुलोद्भवम् ।
आचार्यं हेमचन्द्रं स द्रक्ष्यति क्ष[क्षि]तिनायकः ॥ ५३ ॥
तद्दर्शनात् प्रमुदितः केकीवाम्बुददर्शनात् ।
तं मुनिं वन्दितुं नित्यं स भद्रात्मा त्वरिष्यते ॥ ५४ ॥
तस्य सूरेर्जिनचैत्ये कुर्वतो धर्मदेशनाम् ।
राजा सश्रावकामात्यो वन्दनाय गमिष्यति ॥ ५५ ॥
तत्र देवं नमस्कृत्य स तत्त्वमविदन्नपि ।
वन्दिष्यते तमाचार्यं भावशुद्धेन चेतसा ॥ ५६ ॥
स श्रुत्वा तन्मुखात् प्रीत्या विशुद्धां धर्मदेशनाम् ।
अणुव्रतानि सम्यक्त्वपूर्वकाणि प्रपत्स्यते ॥ ५७ ॥
स प्राप्तबोधो भविता श्रावकाचारपारगः ।
आस्थानेपि स्थितो धर्मगोष्ठ्या स्वं रमयिष्यति ॥ ५८ ॥
अन्नशाकफलादीनां नियमांश्च विशेषतः ।
आदास्यते स प्रत्यहं प्रायेण ब्रह्मचर्यकृत् ॥ ५९ ॥

साधारणस्त्रीर्न परं स सुधीर्वर्जयिष्यति ।
धर्मपत्नीरपि ब्रह्म चरितुं बोधयिष्यति ॥ ६० ॥
मुनेस्तस्योपदेशेन जीवाजीवादितत्त्ववित् ।
आचार्य इव सोन्येषामपि बोधिं प्रदास्यति ॥ ६१ ॥
येर्हध[द्ध]र्मद्विपः[षः] केपि पाण्डुरङ्गद्विजादयः ।
तेपि तस्याज्ञया गर्भश्रावका इव भाविनः ॥ ६२ ॥
अपूजितेषु चैत्येषु गुरुच[ष्व]प्रणतेषु च ।
न भोक्ष्यते स धर्मज्ञः प्रपन्नश्रावकव्रतः ॥ ६३ ॥
अपुत्रमृतपुंसां स द्रविणं न ग्रहीष्यति ।
विवेकस्य फलं ह्येतदतृप्ता ह्यविवेकिनः ॥ ६४ ॥
पाण्डुप्रभृतिभिरपि या त्यक्ता मृगया न हि ।
स स्वयं त्यक्ष्यति जनः सर्वोपि च तदाज्ञया ॥ ६५ ॥
हिंसानिषेधके तस्मिन् दूरेस्तु मृगयादिकम् ।
अपि मत्कुणयूकादीन् नान्त्यजोपि हनिष्यति ॥ ६६ ॥
तस्मिन् निषिद्धपापर्द्धावरण्ये मृगजातयः ।
सदाप्यविघ्नरोमन्था भाविन्यो गोष्ठधेनुवत् ॥ ६७ ॥
जलचरस्थलचरखग[खे]चराणां स देहिनाम् ।
रक्षिष्यति सदामारिं शासने पाकशासनम्[नः] ॥ ६८ ॥
ये वा[चा]जन्मापि मांसादास्ते मांसम्य[स्य] कथामपि ।
दुःस्वप्नमिव तस्याज्ञावशान् नेष्यन्ति विस्मृतिम् ॥ ६९ ॥
दशार्हैर्न परित्यक्तं यत्पुरा श्रावकैरपि ।
तन्मद्यमनवद्यात्मा स सर्वत्र निरोत्स्यति ॥ ७० ॥
स तथा मद्यसंधानं निरोत्स्यति महीतले ।
न यथा मद्यभाण्डानि घटयिष्यति चक्र्यपि ॥ ७१ ॥
मद्यपानं[नां] सदा मद्यव्यसनक्षीणसंपदाम् ।
तदाज्ञात्यक्तमद्यानां प्रभविष्यन्ति संपदः ॥ ७२ ॥
नलादिभिरपि क्ष्मापैर्द्युतं त्यक्तं न यत्पुरा ।
तस्य स्ववैरिण इव नामाप्युन्मूलयिष्यति ॥ ७३ ॥
पारावतपणक्रीडाकुर्कु[कु]टयोधनान्यपि ।
न भविष्यन्ति मेदिन्यां तस्योदयिनि शासने ॥ ७४ ॥
प्रायेण स प्रतिग्राममपि निःसीमवैभवः ।
करिष्यति महीमेतां जिनायतनमण्डिताम् ॥ ७५ ॥
प्रतिग्रामं प्रतिपुरमासमुद्रं महीतले ।
रथयात्रोत्सवं सोर्हत्प्र[त्प्र]तिमानं करिष्यति ॥ ७६ ॥
दायंदायं द्रविणानि विरचय्यानृणं जगत् ।
अङ्कयिष्यति मेदिन्यां स संवत्सरमात्मनः ॥ ७७ ॥
प्रतिमाम्पाशु[पांसु]गुप्तां तां कपिलर्षिप्रतिष्ठिताम् ।
एकदा श्रोष्यति कथाप्रसङ्गे तु गुरोर्मुखात् ॥ ७८ ॥
पांशु[सु]स्थलं खानयित्वा प्रतिमां विश्वपावि[व]नीम् ।
आनेष्यामीति स तदा करिष्यति मनोरथम् ॥ ७९ ॥
तदेव[तदैत]मनभुत्साहं निमित्तान्यपराण्यपि ।
ज्ञात्वा निश्चेष्यते राजा प्रतिमां हस्तगामिनीम् ॥ ८० ॥
ततो गुरुमनुज्ञाप्य नियोज्यायुक्तपौरुषान् ।
प्रारप्स्यते खानयितुं स्थलं वीतभयस्य तत् ॥ ॥ ८१ ॥

सत्त्वेन तस्य परमार्हतस्य पृथिवीपतेः ।
करिष्यति [सु] सांनिध्यं तदा शासनदेवता ॥ ८२ ॥
राज्ञः कुमारपालस्य तस्य पुण्येन भूयसा ।
खन्यमाने स्थले श्रु[म]क्षु प्रतिमाविर्भविष्यति ॥ ८३ ॥
तदा तस्यै प्रतिमायै यदुदायनभूभुजा ।
ग्रामाणां शासनं दत्तं तदप्याविर्भविष्यति ॥ ८४ ॥
नृपायुक्तास्तां प्रतिमां प्रश्ना[ता]मपि नवामिव ।
रथमारोपयिष्यन्ति पूजयित्वा यथाविधि ॥ ८५ ॥
पूजाप्रकारेषु पथि जायमानेषु अनेकशः ।
क्रियमाणेष्वहोरात्रं संगीतेषु निरन्तरम् ॥ ८६ ॥
तालिकारासिकेषूच्चैर्भवति [भवत्सु] ग्रामयोषिताम् ।
पञ्चशब्देश्वातोद्येषु वाद्यमानेषु संमदात् ॥ ८७ ॥
पक्षद्वये चामरेषूत्पतत्सु च पतत्सु च ।
नेष्यन्ति सप्र[प्र]तिमां तां युक्ताः पत्तनसीमनि ॥ ८८ ॥

त्रिभिर्विशेषकम् ॥

सान्तःपुरपरीवारश्चतुरङ्गचमूवृतः ।
सकलं संघमादाय राजा तामभियास्यति ॥ ८९ ॥
स्वयं रथात्समुत्तीर्य गजेन्द्रमधिरुह्य च ।
प्रवेशयिष्यति पुरे प्रतिमां तां स भूपतिः ॥ ९० ॥
स्वपत्यभु[भ]वनं क्रीडाभवने संनिवेश्य ताम् ।
कुमारपालो विधिवत् त्रिसंध्यं पूजयिष्यति ॥ ९१ ॥
प्रतिमायास्तथा तस्या वाचयित्वा स शासनम् ।
उद्दा[दा]यनेन यद्दत्तं तत् प्रमाणीकरिष्यति ॥ ९२ ॥
प्रासादोष्टापदस्यैव युवराजः[ज] स कारितः ।
जनयिष्यत्यसंभाव्यो विस्मयं जगतोपि हि ॥ ९३ ॥
स भूपतिः प्रतिमया तत्र स्थापितया तया ।
एधिष्यसे प्रतापेन ऋद्ध्या निःश्रेयसेन च ॥ ९४ ॥
देवभक्त्या गुरुभक्त्या त्वत्पितुः सदृशोभय ।
कुमारपालो भूपालः स भविष्यति भारते ॥ ९५ ॥
इति श्रुत्वा नमस्कृत्य भगवन्तमथाभयः ।
उपश्रो[श्रे]णिकमागत्य वक्तुमेवं प्रचक्रमे ॥ ९६ ॥

The date in the first verse is of extraordinary interest. It shows distinctly that Hemacandra, like the other S'vetāmbaras, put the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvira 470 years before the beginning of the Vikrama era. For only 1669–470 gives the right date V. S. 1199 for the beginning of Kumārapāla's reign. Jacobi, *Kalpasūtra*, p. 8, has called attention to the fact that Hemacandra's statements in the *Paris'iṣṭaparvan* do not coincide with the usual calculation. The coronation of Candragupta is there, VIII, 339, placed 155 years after the Nirvāṇa, whereas the old *Gāthās* add another sixty years. The latter say that Mahāvira died in the night when Pālaka was crowned. According to them, Pālaka reigned 60 years, the Nandas 155, and between Candragupta's coronation and the beginning of the Vikrama-era, 255 years passed. Upon this Jacobi based two hypotheses, firstly that Hemacandra, having referred to a better tradition, left out the sixty years of Pālaka, and secondly that he placed the Nirvāṇa, 410 years before the beginning of the Vikrama era, in the year 467/66 B. C. I do not think that these deductions are tenable. For, according to the *Paris'iṣṭaparvan* VI, 243:

अनन्तरं वर्धमानस्वामिनिर्वाणवासरात् ।
गतायां षष्टिवत्सर्यामेष नन्दोऽभवन्नृपः ॥

Nanda I ascended the throne 60 years after Mahāvīra's death. The calculation of the *Paris'iṣṭaparvan* is therefore this: from the Nirvāṇa up to Nanda I sixty years, from Nanda I's coronation up to Candragupta's coronation 95 years, or a total of 155. From this, Jacobi's first premise is proved wrong. As regards the second one, it has so far not been proved that Hemacandra, like the *Gāthās*, placed only 255 years between Candragupta and the beginning of the Vikrama-era. The circumstance that, according to the *Mahāvīracarita*, the Nirvāṇa took place 470 years before Vikrama, makes it probable, (unless there is a careless mistake in the *Paris'iṣṭaparvan*) that Hemacandra or his authority counted 315 years between Candragupta's coronation and the beginning of the Vikrama-Saṁvat and similarly, like the Ceylonese Buddhists, placed the former event too early. For this reason, it seems to me that the assumption of the S'vetāmbaras of the 12th century having two dates, 597/6 and 467/6 B. C. for Vardhamāna's Nirvāṇa, is not likely. In Note 15 to my lecture about the Jainas, p. 38 of the separate reprint, I have shown that the date 467/66 B. C. for Vardhamāna's death cannot be correct, if S'ākyamuni Gautama died about 477 B. C.

67. The statement that Vāgbhaṭa was a minister of Kumārapāla is found in the *Kumāravihārapras'asti*, verse 87, see Peterson, *Third Report*, App., p. 316. This point is of some importance. For Vāgbhaṭa does not occur in the inscriptions of Kumārapāla's reign, which have so far been made known. However, as the *Pras'asti* is by a pupil of Hemacandra's, its statement deserves credence. The *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 676 mentions V. S. 1213 as the year of the consecration of the temple at S'atruñjaya; the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 219, V. S. 1211. The *Kumārapālacarita*, p. 184 agrees with the latter work.

The date of the consecration of Āmrabhaṭa's temple in Broach occurs in the *Kumārapālacarita*, p. 185.

68. The extract from the *Moharājaparājaya*, in which amongst others the last verse, *s'rī-s'vetāmbara-Hemacandravacasām* etc. quoted by Kielhorn, *Report of 1880-81*, occurs, begins in the *Kumārapālacarita*, p. 161, line 14, and ends on p. 177, line 1. The passage in question is to be found on p. 167, lines 17 ff., where we read:-

अथ संप्राप्ते शुभलग्ने निर्मलभाववारिभिः कृतमङ्गलमज्जनः सत्कीर्तिचन्दनावलिप्तदेह:[हो] नैकाभिग्रहोल्लसद्भूषणालंकृत:[तो] दानकङ्कणरोचिष्णुदक्षिणपाणिः संवेगरंगङ्ग[गग]जाधिरूढः सदाचारच्छत्रोपशोभितः श्रद्धासहोदरया क्रियमाणलवणोत्तरणविधिः १२ शतकोटिव्रतभङ्गसुभगजन्यलोकपरिवृतः श्रीदेवगुरुभक्तिदेशविरतिजानिनीभि(?)र्गीयमानधवलमङ्गलः क्रमेण प्राप्तः पौषधागारद्वारतोरणे पञ्चविधस्वाध्यायवाद्यमानातोद्यध्वनिरूपे प्रसर्पति विरतिश्वश्वा कृतप्रेङ्खणाचारः शमदमादिशा[श्या]लकदार्शितसरणिर्मातृगृहमध्यस्थितायाः शीलधवलचीवरध्यानद्वयकुण्डन[ल]पदूहरे(?) तपोभेदमुद्रिकाद्यलंकृतायाः कृपसुन्दर्याः सं० १२१६ मार्गे सु० २ दिने पाणिं जग्राह श्रीकुमारपालः । श्रीमदर्हदे[द्दे]वतासमक्षं ततः श्यागमोक्तश्राद्धगुणगुणितद्वादशव्रतकलशावलिं विचारचारुतोरणां नवतत्त्वनवाङ्गवेदीं कृत्वा प्रबोधाग्निमुदाप्य[मुद्दीप्य] भावनासर्पिस्तर्पितं श्रीहेमाचार्यो भूदेवः सवधूकं नृपं प्र[प्र]दक्षण[क्षिण]यामास ॥

69. The MS. in question is described by Peterson, *Third Report*, App. I, p. 67. The inscription is the presentation of land by the *Mahāmaṇḍalīka* Pratāpasiṁha, which is preserved in the temple of *Pārs'vanātha* in Naḍḍūla-Nāṁḍol. The beginning of the same reads, according to the copy which I made in 1873:

॥ ॐ ॥ संवत् १२१३ वर्षे माघे वदि १० शुक्रे ॥ श्रीमदणहिलपाटके समस्तराजावलिसमलंकृतपरमभट्टारकमहाराजाधिराजपरमेश्वर-उमापतिवरलब्धप्रसादप्रौढप्रतापनिजभुजविक्रमरणांगणविनिर्जित-शाकम्भरीभूपालश्रीकुमारपालदेवकल्याणविजयराज्ये । तत्पादोपजीविनि महामात्यश्रीचाहडदेवे श्रीश्रीकरणादौ सकलमुद्राव्यापारान् परिपन्थयति........

As the inscription contains a presentation to the Jainas, one might surely expect a mention of Kumārapāla's conversion, in case the same had already taken place before that time. The exact date of this is, according to Dr. Schram's calculation, January 20th, 1156, a Friday.

69a. The *Alaṁkāracūḍāmaṇi* is written in *Sūtras*, and is provided with a very clear, detailed

commentary, containing a large number of examples to illustrate the rules. The work consists of eight *Adhyāyas*, the contents of which is as follows:-

I. *Mañgala*, Purpose of Poetry, Qualifications of the poet, the Nature of Poetry, the three *s'aktis* of the word, pp. 1-48.

II. The doctrine of the *Rasas*, pp. 49-96.

III. The errors of poetic composition, pp. 97-169.

IV. The advantages of poetic composition, pp. 169-174.

V. The *S'abdālaṃkāras*, pp. 175-200.

VI. The *Arthālaṃkāras*, pp. 201-250.

VII. The suitable characters for poetic presentation, pp. 251-279

VIII. The kinds of poetic composition, pp. 280-291.

The MS. which I used, is India Office Library (*Sanskrit-MSS.*, Bühler) No. 111. It was put together by S'āstri Vāmanācārya Jhalkīkar, after a comparison of several old MSS.

70. See *Vāgbhaṭālaṃkāra*, ed. Borooah, IV, 45, 76, 81, 85, 125, 129, 132, 152.

In the fifth and eighth passages Jayasiṃha's victory over Varvaraka or Barbaraka is mentioned, which is spoken about in the *Dvyās'rayakāvya* and in the Caulukya-inscriptions.

71. About the Berlin-MS. of *Chandonus'āsana* or *Chandas'cūḍāmaṇi*, see Weber, *Katalog.*, vol. II, sect. I, p. 268. We must add to his description that the leaves 27, 29-31, 36-40, show, besides the usual figures on the left, the symbols of the old *akṣarapalli*. The Commentary on the small work is very detailed and contains, according to the colophon of the Jesalmir MS. 4100 *Granthas*. I had no MS. of the latter at my disposal for this work. My remarks are based upon notes previously taken.

72. *Alaṃkāracūḍāmaṇi*, III. 2 has, in explanation of the error:

हतवृत्तत्व । एतदपवादस्तु स्वछन्दोनुशासनेऽस्माभिर्निरूपित इति नेह प्रतन्यते ।

73. The *S'eṣākhyā Nāmamālā* is reprinted in Böhtlink-and Rieu's edition of *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*. As regards the Berlin MSS. see Weber, *Katalog.*, vol. II, sect. I, pp. 258 f. The work agrees to a very remarkable extent with the older *Vaijayantī* of Yādavaprakās'a, from which a number of rare words has been borrowed.

74. The *Nighaṇṭu* is mentioned in the list of Hemacandra's works at the end of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* under the name *Nirghaṇṭa*. We read there, XXII, 836-40:

व्याकरण[णं] पञ्चाङ्गं प्रमाणशास्त्र[स्त्रं] प्रमाणमीमांसाः[साम्] ।
छन्दोलंकृतिचूडामणी च शास्त्रे विभुर्व्यधित्तः[धित] ॥ ८३६ ॥
एकार्थानेकार्थो देश्या निर्घण्ट इति च चत्वारः ।
विहिताश्च ता[ना]मकोशाः शुचिकवितानद्युपाध्यायाः ॥ ८३७ ॥
स्यु[ग्यु]त्तरषष्टिशलाकानरेतिवृत्तं गृहिव्रतविचारे ।
अध्यात्मयोगशास्त्रं विदधे जगदुपकृतिविधित्सुः ॥ ८३८ ॥
लक्षणसाहित्यगुणं विदधे च द्व्याश्रय[यं] महाकाव्यम् ।
चक्रे विंशतिमुच्चैः स वीतरागस्तवानां च ॥ ८३९ ॥
इति तद्विहितग्रन्थसंख्यैव न हि विद्यते ।
नामानि न विदन्त्येभ्या[षां] मादृशा मन्दमेधसः ॥ ८४० ॥

As regards the fragments found, see my *Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts*,

1874/75, pp. 6 f., and the List of the *Elphinstone College Collection 1866/68* under **Kosha**. There is a copy of the *Nighaṇṭus'eṣa, dhānyakāṇḍa*, in the *Deccan College Collection 1875/77*, No. 735.

75. The verses, in which Kumārapāla is named, are found in Pischel's edition (*Bombay Sanskrit Series* No. XVII) I, 97, 107, 116, 127; II, 39, 90; III, 46; IV, 16; VI, 10, 19, 26; VII, 7, 13, 40, 53. Those addressed to Culukka or Cālukka are:- I, 66, 84; II, 30; VI, 5, 7, 15, 17, 111; VIII, 51. We may also remark that Jayasiṁha-Siddharāja is named in one single verse II, 4, and that his victory over Barbaraka is mentioned.

The verse IV, 32, perhaps refers to the same king:-
"O earthly tree of Paradise, O thou, whose strong arm is like unto a tree, the gutters of the houses in Paiṭṭhāṇa are filled with the sap of the strength of thy elephants."

Bhāṇḍārkar has recently discovered fragments of a historical work, which speaks of a conquest of Pratiṣṭhāna-Paiṭhāṇ by Jayasiṁha, see *Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts of 1883-84*, p. 10. It is also possible that Hāla-Sātavāhana is meant by the "earthly tree of Paradise", as his name also occurs otherwise in the *Des'īnāmamāla*.

76. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 225-226, relates, that Kumārapāla was guilty of a linguistic solecism, when he used the word *aupamyā* instead of *upamā* or *aupamyam*. Then, we are told, he studied the *S'āstras* beginning with the *mātṛkāpāṭha* with some Pandit or other. In one year he absolved three *Kāvyas* with the Commentaries, and then received the title of honour *Vicāracaturmukha*. The same story occurs in the *Kumārapālacarita*, p. 105, where Hemacandra is mentioned as the teacher.

77. An interesting proof of the significance of Jainism in Aṇhilvāḍ before Hemacandra's time is furnished by the discovery of the drama *Karṇasundarī*, which was recently published by Paṇḍit Durgāprasāda in the Bombay *Kāvyamālā*. The piece was written by the famous poet Bilhaṇa, and was intended to be acted in the temple of S'āntināth at the feast of Nābheya, which was instituted by the minister Sampatkara (Sāṁtu?). The first verse of the Nāndī, an imitation of the beginning of the *Nāgānanda*, is therefore addressed to the Jina. The hero, as stated by the poet in Act I, verse 10 himself, is the son of Bhīmadeva, i. e. king Karṇa, who reigned from V. S. 1120 to 1150. Other evidence of the influence of the Jainas at the court of Aṇhilvāḍ may be found in the *Pras'astis* of the old MSS. where many Jainas are mentioned as occupying official positions under the first Caulukyas, especially in the department of finance.

78. The story is found in *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 137 ff., and its contents are as follows:- When Kumārapāla was inclined towards Jainism, the Brahmins called in Rājācārya Devabodhi. This was a great Yogi, who had made the goddess Bhāratī submissive to him, and was acquainted with sorcery and knew the past and the future. After the king had heard that Devabodhi had come into the neighbourhood of Aṇhilvāḍa, he received him with great honour, and led him to his palace. The greater part of the day passed in ceremonies of reception. In the afternoon the king worshipped a picture of S'āntinātha in the presence of the whole court. Then Devabodhi admonished him to desist from the Jaina faith. When Kumārapāla praised the latter on account of the Ahiṁsā doctrine and blamed the S'rauta Dharma on account of the Hiṁsā, Devabodhi caused the gods Brahman, Viṣṇu and S'iva, as well as the seven Caulukya-princes—Mūlarāja and his successors—to appear; and they of course spoke in favour of the religion of the Vedas. On the following morning Hemacandra considerably outdid Devabodhi's feats. At first he caused his seat to be pulled away, and then executed the trick which was supposed to be a great favourite amongst the Yogis, namely, that of holding himself up in mid-air. Then he caused the entire Olympus of the Jainas to appear before the king, together with all the king's ancestors, who worshipped the Jinas. Finally he explained that the apparitions were only an illusion, just as those produced by Devabodhi had been. Only that which Somanātha had told the king in the temple of Devapattana was the truth. This of course assured his victory. Regarding Devabodhi, who was probably a historical personage, see also above, page 20.

79. Merutunga's statement is quoted above, page 30 and Note 61. He says wrongly that the *Trişaştis'alākāpuruşacarita* was written before the *Yogas'āstra*. This statement is repeated by *Jinamaṇḍana*. The *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 775 ff. and 899 ff. gives the date of the two works as much later, but it puts the *Yogas'āstra* first.

80. The first four *Prakās'as* of the *Yogas'āstra* are known through E. Windisch's edition and translation in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. XXVIII, pp. 185 ff. The contents of the last eight *Prakās'as*, which are preserved only in very few MSS. are as follows:-

Prakās'a V, about certain exercises belonging to the Yoga and their results, as they are taught by others, according to the Commentary of Patañjali and others. To these belong 1) the *Prāṇāyāma*, by which one learns how to control the winds of the body and the *Manas*, s'l. 1-25, 2) the *Dhāraṇā*, by which one learns how to conduct the winds into any parts of the body one likes, and to draw them out again, s'l. 26-35, 3) the observation of the movements of the winds in the body, by which one can foretell death and life, fortune and misfortune, s'l. 36-120, 4) other methods of predetermining the death through meditation and divination, s'l. 121-224, 5) methods of determining victory and defeat, success or failure of undertakings and so forth, s'l. 225-251, 6) the cleansing of the *Nāḍīs*, the arteries, which are the paths of the wind, s'l. 252-263, 2) the *Vedhavidhi* and *Parapurapraves'a*, the art of separating the soul from the body and of causing it to enter other bodies, s'l. 264-273.

Prakās'a VI, s'lokas 7, about the futility of *Parapurapraves'a* and *Prāṇāyāma* for gaining salvation, -- for which purpose, however, the *Pratyāhāra* taught by some is useful,-and about the parts of the body which come into question for meditation (*dhyāna*).

Prakās'a VII, s'lokas 28, the *Piṇḍastha Dhyāna*, the meditation about bodies, with its five sub-divisions called *Dhāraṇā*, *viz.*, the *Pārthivī*, *Āgneyī*, *Mārutī*, *Vāruṇī* and *Tatrabhū*, see Bhāṇḍārkar, *Report of 1883/84*, pp. 110-111.

Prakās'a VIII, s'lokas 78, the *Padastha Dhyāna*, the meditation on sacred words or syllables, which one imagines as written upon lotus-leaves, (see Bhāṇḍārkar, *loc. cit.* p. 111).

Prakās'a IX, s'lokas 15, the *Rūpastha Dhyāna*, the meditation on the form of Arhat, (see Bhāṇḍarkar, *loc. cit.* p. 112).

Prakās'a X, s'lokas 24, (1) the *Rūpātīta Dhyāna*, the meditation on the formless *Paramātman*, which is only intelligence and rapture, i. e. the released soul, with which one identifies oneself, thereby making oneself like unto it; (2) another division of meditation, in 4 parts, namely, *Ājñādhyāna*, *Apāyavicayadhyāna*, *Vipākavicayadhyāna* and *Saṁsthānadhyāna*.

Prakās'a XI, s'lokas 61, the *S'ukla Dhyāna*; see Bhāṇḍārkar, *loc. cit.* p. 110.

Prakās'a XII, s'lokas 55, concluding remarks of the author, based upon his own experience, upon that which is especially necessary to the Yogī and leads him to salvation.

It is now easily understood why this part of the work, which is really the part which justifies the title, has not been much copied, whilst the MSS. of the first four *Prakās'as* are even now often explained to laymen as a text-book for their duties.

The Commentary to the *Yogas'āstra* was written by Hemacandra after the completion of the text as well as of the *Vītarāgastotra*, which, according to the *Prabandhas*, belonged to the *Yogas'āstra*, (Note 81). For verses of the latter (i. e. the *Vītarāgastotra*) are often quoted, e. g. II, 7; III, 123; IV, 103; and the last verse of the *Yogas'āstra* even in the explanation of I, 4.

The explanation of the first four *Prakās'as* is extraordinarily detailed. The words of the text are expounded by very numerous quotations, and the stories, to which allusion is made, are related at great length. It is especially interesting that the legend of Sthūlabhadra in III, 131 is given in almost exactly the same words as in the *Paris'iştaparvan* VIII, 2-193 and IX, 55-111a, without, however,

there being any mention of the existence of the latter work. Amongst Hemacandra's own works quotations are taken, generally with the mention *yad avocāma* or *yad uktam asmābhiḥ*, from the Grammer, the *Dhātupātha*, the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* and the *Liṅgānus'āsana* besides the *Vītarāgastotra*. In addition, the Commentary often gives appended explanations of the author in the case of difficult points, which are introduced with the words *atrāntare s'lokaḥ*. At the end of the Commentary on *Prakās'a* IV there is a verse hinting that the first main section has been concluded:

इति निगदितमेतत्साधनं ध्यानसिद्धे-
र्यैनिगृहिगतभेदादेव रत्नत्रयं च ।
सकलमपि यदन्यद् ध्यानभेदादि सम्यक्
प्रकटितमुपरिष्टादष्टभिस्तत् प्रकाशैः ॥

The conclusion of the work, XII, 55 reads thus:

या शास्त्रात्सुगुरोर्मुखादनुभवाच्चाज्ञायि किंचित् क्वचिद्
योगस्योपनिषद् विवेकपरिषच्चेतश्चमत्कारिणी ।
श्रीचौलुक्यकुमारपालनृपतेरत्यर्थमभ्यर्थनाद्
आचार्येण निवेशिता पथि गिरां श्रीहेमचन्द्रेण सा ॥ ५५ ॥

या योगस्योपनिषद्रहस्यमज्ञायि ज्ञाता । कुतः । शास्त्राद् द्वादशाङ्गात् । सुगुरोः सदागमव्याख्यातुर्मुखात् साक्षादुपदेशात् । अनुभवाच्च स्वसंवेदनरूपात् । किंचित् क्वचिदिति स्वमज्ञानानुसारेण । क्वचिदित्येकत्र सर्वस्य ज्ञातुमशक्यत्वात्प्रदेशभेदे क्वचन । उपनिषदं विशिनष्टि । विवेकिनां योगरुचीनां या परिषत्सभा तस्या यच्चेतस्तच्चमत्करोतीत्येवंशीला सा योगोपनिषत् । श्रीचौलुक्यो यः कुमारपालनृपतिस्तस्यात्यर्थमभ्यर्थनया । स हि योगोपासनप्रियो दृष्टयोगशास्त्रान्तरश्च......भ्यो योगशास्त्रेभ्यो नि...णं योगशास्त्रं शुश्रूषमाणः......सर्वनरो वचनस्य......गिरां पथि निवेशि[तवा]न् आचार्यो हेमचन्द्र इति शुभम् ॥

श्रीचौलुक्यक्षितिपतिकृतप्रार्थनाप्रेरितोऽहं
स[त]त्त्वज्ञानामृतजलनिधेर्योगशास्त्रस्य वृत्तिम् ।
स्वोपज्ञस्य व्यचरयमि[मां तावद्] एषा च नन्द्याद्
यावज्जैनप्रोवचनवती भूर्भुवःस्व[स्त्र]यीयम् ॥ १ ॥
संप्रापि योगशास्त्रात्तद्विवृतेश्चापि यन्मया सुकृतम् ।
तेन जिनबोधिलाभप्रणयी भव्यो जनो भवतात् ॥ २ ॥

Then follows the famous Colophon. The MS. which I have before me, belonging to the library of the Vienna University, contains 167 leaves with 19 lines on each page. Unfortunately the last page has suffered greatly through use, and cannot be completely deciphered. The date seems to be missing. However, the very archaic script makes it probable that the MS. is about 300–400 years old. The *Granthāgras* of the single *Prakās'as* are: Pr. I=2000; Pr. II=3500; Pr. III=3900; Pr. IV=2300; Pr. V=640; Pr. VI=18; Pr. VII=39; Pr. VIII=149; Pr. IX=21; Pr. X=84; Pr. XI=210; Pr. XII, illegible. It is also added that the *Granthasaṁkhyā* of the last eight *Prakās'as* is 1500 and that of the whole is 12,000, which cannot be quite correct. Old MSS. of the work are described in Dr. Peterson's *First Report*, App. 22, 57 and in *Third Report*, App. 14, 15, 74, 143, 176. The oldest, *Third Report*, p. 74, is of the year V. S. 1251, and was therefore written 22 years after Hemacandra's death.

81. According to a MS. which was recently sent to me from Bombay the *Vītarāgastotra* consists of twenty quite short sections, each of which bears the name *stava* or *prakās'a*:

1) *Prastāvanāstavaḥ*, 8 *s'lokas*, begins:

यः परात्मा परं ज्योतिः परमः परमेष्ठिनाम् ।
आदित्यवर्णं तमसः पुरस्तादामनन्ति यम् ॥ १ ॥

2) *Sahajātis'ayastavaḥ*, 9 *s'lokas*, begins:

श्रीहेमचन्द्रप्रभवाद् वीतरागस्तवादितः ।
कुमारपालभूपालः प्राप्नोतु फलमीप्सितम् ॥ १ ॥

3) *Karmakṣayajātistavaḥ*, 15 *s'lokas.*
4) *Surakṛtātis'ayastavaḥ*, 14 *s'lokas.*
5) *Pratihāryastavaḥ*, 9 *s'lokas.*
6) *Prātipakṣanirāsastavaḥ*, 12 *s'lokas.*
7) *Jagatkartṛnirāsastavaḥ*, 8 *s'lokas.*
8) *Ekāntanirāsastavaḥ*, 12 *s'lokas.*
9) *Kalistavaḥ*, 8 *s'lokas.*
10) *Adbh*[illegible]*vaḥ*, 8 *s'lokas.*
11) *Ma*[illegible] 8 *s'lokas.*
12) *Vair*[illegible], 8 *s'lokas.*
13) *Hetu*[illegible], 8 *s'lokas.*
14) *Yogasiddh*[illegible], 8 *s'lokas.*
15) *Bhaktistava*[illegible] *lokas.*
16) *Ātmagarhāstavaḥ*, 9 *s'lokas.*
17) *S'araṇagamanastavaḥ*, 8 *s'lokas.*
18) *Kaṭhoroktistavaḥ*, 10 *s'lokas.*
19) *Ājñāstavaḥ*, 8 *s'lokas.*
20) *Ās'īstavaḥ*, 8 *s'lokas;* it ends:

तव प्रेष्योऽस्मि दासोऽस्मि सेवकोऽस्म्यस्मि किंकरः ।
ओमिति प्रतिपद्यस्व नाथ नातः परं ब्रुवे ॥ ८ ॥

The stotra is a short poetic compendium of the Jaina-doctrine, and may have been Hemacandra's first attempt to acquaint Kumārapāla with the teachings of Jainism.

82. *Indian Antiquary*, vol. IV, pp. 268–269.

83. The story of Yūkavihāra is to be found in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* p. 232, and that of the punishment of Lakṣa in the *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 823-830. Kelhaṇa of Naḍḍūla is a historical personage, and is mentioned in an inscription of V. S. 1218, see above, page 38. The issue of the edict of Amāri is, of course, mentioned also in all the *Prabandhas*. In the *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 691, we read that it was announced in the whole kingdom with the sound of drums. In the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* pp. 211, 243 it is said that the edict was issued for a limited period of fourteen years. In the *Kumārapālacarita* it is mentioned on p. 144, line 16, pp. 152. ff., and many details are given, which repeat and extend the accounts of the *Dvyās'raya* and of the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi.*

84. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 690–691; *Kumārapālacarita* p. 154.

85. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 692–702; *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* pp. 216–217; *Kumārapālacarita* p. 205, where an anecdote of a certain case is also related; *Kīrtikaumudī* II, 43–44. The *Prabhāvakacaritra* remarks in verse 693 expressly that it was the merchants (*vyavahārin*) whose fortune was confiscated if they died without leaving sons. The passage, just mentioned in the *Abhijñānas'ākuntala*, is to be found in the 6th Act, pp. 138–139, ed. Pischel.

86. The very much spoiled verses, *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 603-609, refer to the Kumāravihāra. There is a second passage about the buildings; verses 683-689, where we read:

प्रासादैः ससहस्तैश्च यवावर्णौ(?) महीपतिः ।
द्वात्रिंशतं विहाराणां सारण्यां निरमापयत् ॥ ६८३ ॥
द्वौ शुभ्रौ द्वौ च – – ⏑ द्वौ रक्तोत्पलवर्णकौ ।
द्वौ नीलौ षोडशाथ स्युः प्रासादाः कनकप्रभाः ॥ ६८४ ॥
श्रीरोहिणिश्च समवसरणं प्रभुपादुका ।
अशोकविटपी चैवं द्वात्रिंशत्स्थापितास्तदा ॥ ६८२ ॥
चतुर्विंशतिचैत्येषु श्रीमन्त ऋषभादयः ।
सीमन्धराद्याश्चत्वारो चतुर्षु निलयेषु व[च] ॥ ६८६ ॥
द्वात्रिंशतः पूरुषाणामनृणात्मातिगर्भितम्(?) ।
व्यजिज्ञपत् प्रभोर्भूप[:] पूर्ववाह्यानुसारतः ॥ ६८७ ॥
स पञ्चविंशतिवाताङ्कुलमानो जिनेश्वरः ।
श्रीमत्तिहुणपालाख्ये पञ्चविंशतिहस्तके ॥ ६८८ ॥
विहारेस्थाप्यत श्रीमान् नेमिनाथोपरैरपि ।
समस्तदेशस्थानेषु जैनचैत्यान्यचीकरत् ॥ ६८९ ॥

Hemacandra's advice, upon which Kumārapāla was to build 32 te[m]ples as penance for the sins of his 32 teeth, is be found, *loc. cit.* verse 701. Thirdly, in verses 722-[?], there is an account of a temple in S'atruñjaya, which was 24 *hastas* high, and which, as the author adds, is still to be seen at present.

The fourth passage consists of verses 807-821:

एवं कृतार्थयन् जन्म सप्तक्षेत्र्या धनं वपन् ।
चक्रे सम्प्रतिवज्जैनभवनैर्मण्डितां महीम् ॥ ८०७ ॥
श्रीशलाकानृणां वृत्तं स्वोपज्ञप्रभवोन्यदा ।
व्याचख्युर्नृपतेर्धर्मस्थिरीकरणहेतवे ॥ ८०८ ॥
श्रीमहावीरवृत्तं च व्याख्यात[न्तः] सूरयोन्यदा ।
देवाधिदेवसंयंधं[बन्धं] व्याचख्युर्भूपतेः पुरः ॥ ८०९ ॥
यथा प्रभावती देवी भूपालोदयनप्रिया ।
श्रीचेठकावनीपालपुत्री तस्या यथा पुरा ॥ ८१० ॥
वारिधौ यत[व्यन्त]रः कश्चिद्यानपात्रं महालयम् ।
स्तम्भयित्वार्पयत्[च्] श्राद्धस्यार्ध[च] संपुटं दृढम् ॥ ८११ ॥
एनं देवाधिदेवं य उपलक्षयिता प्रभुम् ।
स प्रकाशयितान्य(?) इत्युक्त्वासौ तिरोदधे ॥ ८१२ ॥
पुरे वीतभये यानपात्रे संघटिते यथा ।
अन्यैर्नोद्घाटितं देव्या वीराख्यायाः[ख्यया] प्रकाशितः [तम् ?] ॥ ८१३ ॥
यथा प्रद्योतराजस्य हस्तं सा प्रतिमा गता ।
दास्या तत्प्रतिबिम्बं च मुक्तं पश्चात्पुरे यथा ॥ ८१४ ॥
ग्रन्थगौरवभीत्या च ता[न] तथा वर्णिता कथा ।
श्रीवीरचरिताद्बो[ज्ज्ञे]या तस्यां श्रुतिसकौतुकैः ॥ ८१५ ॥

षड्भिः कुलकम् ॥

तां श्रुत्वा भूपतिः कल्पहस्तान्निपुणधिरधौ (?) ।
प्रेष्य वीतभये श्र[श्रू]न्येवी[ची]खनत्तद् भुवं क्षणात् ॥ ८१६ ॥

राजमन्दिरमालोक्य भुवोमुन[मोन्त]स्तितिहर्षिताः ।
देवतावसरस्थानं प्रादुर्बिम्बं तथार्हतः ॥ ८१७ ॥
आनीतं च विभो राजधानीमतिशयोत्सवैः ।
स प्रवेश[शं] दधे तस्य सौधदैवतवेश्मनि ॥ ८१८ ॥
प्रासादः स्फाटिकस्तत्र तद्योग्यः पृथिवीभृता ।
प्रारेभेथ निषिद्धश्च प्रभुभिर्भाविवेदिभिः ॥ ८१९ ॥
राजप्रासादमध्ये च न हि देवगु[गृ]हं भवेत् ।
इत्थगान्या[माज्ञा]मनुल्लङ्घ्य न्यवर्तत ततो नृपः ॥ ८२० ॥
एकातपत्रतां जैनशासनस्य प्रकाशयत[न्] ।
मिथ्यात्वशैलवज्रं श्रीहेमचन्द्रप्रभुर्बभौ ॥ ८२१ ॥

The same story is told in the *Kumārapālacarita* pp. 264, f.

87. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* pp. 216, 219, 231, 232, 238. Jinamaṇḍana repeats the accounts of his predecessors and gives us nothing new of importance, except that, on p. 282, he brings the number of restorations made by Kumārapāla up to 16,000.

88. The minister Yas'odhavala is mentioned in the colophon at the bottom of a MS. of the *Kalpacūrṇi*, Kielhorn, *Report*, App., p. 11. Somes'vara in the *Pras'asti* (*Kīrtikaumudī* App. A., pp. 5 and 14, verse 35) tells us of Yas'odhavala, the Paramāra prince of Candrāvatī and Acalagaḍh, that he fought with Kumārapāla against Mālvā and killed king Ballāla. The *Prabhāvakacaritra* knows that he was placed upon the throne by Kumārapāla after the sentence of his uncle Vikramasiṁha. Vikramasiṁha is not mentioned by Somes'vara, but, on the other hand, he is mentioned in the *Dvyās'rayamahākāvya*. The princes of Candrāvatī were not very powerful, and were vassals of the Caulukyas in the 12th and 13th centuries. It is therefore not improbable that Yas'odhavala was for a time Kumārapala's Pradhān. About Kapardin, see, for instance, *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* pp. 226–230; according to the *Prabandhakoṣa*, p. 102, he was a Paramāra-Rājput.

89. Unfortunately I am not in a position to make quite exact statements as to the extent of this work, as I have only been able to see a few extracts, – the *Jainarāmāyaṇa* printed in Calcutta, the *Paris'iṣṭaparvan* published by H. Jacobi in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, and the MS. of the Royal Asiatic Society, which contains the eighth *Parvan*. The MS. of the Deccan College, No. 47, *Coll. of 1874/75*, in which ths *Parvans* I, II, IV are missing, is written upon 715 leaves, with 15 line on a side. The Cambay-Bhāṇḍār contains palm-leaf MSS. of Parvan I (Peterson, *First Rep.*, p. 87), II (Peterson, *First Rep.*, p. 19), III (Peterson, *First Rep.* A., p. 11, *Third Rep.* A., p. 124), VII (Peterson, *First Rep.* A., p. 23, *Third Rep.*, A., p. 145), VIII (Peterson, *First Rep.* A., p. 34, *Third Rep.*, A., p. 144), X (Peterson, *First Rep.* A., p. 35) and of the *Paris'iṣṭaparvan* (Peterson, *First Rep.*, p. 35). Jinamaṇḍana's account is to be found in the *Kumārapālacarita* p. 235, line 16 and is probably approximately correct.

90. I discovered this work (see *Report on S. MSS.* 1879/80, pp. 2,5) in a MS., where it follows the text of the Sanskrit *Dvyās'rayakāvya*. As regards other MSS., see Peterson, *Third Rep.*, p. 19 and Kielhorn, *Report for 1880/81*, p. 77, No. 374. It contains only 950 *s'lokas* together with the Commentary. Quotations from it are to be found in Jinamaṇḍana, *Kumārapālacarita* p. 194. The latter are the only parts of the little work, which are now available to me.

91. See Böhtlingk and Rieu, *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* p. VII.

92. The verses in question, according to my copy from No. 702, *Deccan College Collection 1875/77*, read:-

श्रीहेमसूरिशिष्येण श्रीमन्महेन्द्रसूरिणा ।
भक्तिनिष्ठेन टीकेयं तन्नाम्नैव प्रतिष्ठिता ॥ १ ॥

13

सम्यग्ज्ञाननिधेर्गुणैरनवधेः श्रीहेमचन्द्रप्रभो-
र्ग्रन्थे व्याकृतिकौस[श]लं व्यसनि[नां] कास्मादृशां तादृशम् ।
व्याख्याम स्म तथापि तं पुनरिदं नाश्चर्यमन्तर्मनस्
तस्याजस्रं स्थितस्य हि वयं व्याख्यामनुब्रूमहे ॥ २ ॥

Compare also Th. Zachariae, *Beiträge zur indischen Lexicographie*, pp. 75 ff. I do not think that Hemacandra wrote the beginning of the Commentary himself; Zachariae declares this to be possible.

93. There are MSS. of this work with a Commentary by Malliṣeṇa, in the *Deccan College Collection 1872/73*, Nos. 195-196; *1873/74*, No. 286; *1880/81*, No. 413. I am unable to say anything in detail about the work, as I have now no copy of it with me.

94. As regards Rāmacandra's *Raghuvilāpa*, see my *Report on the Search for S. MSS. 1874/75* There is one copy of the work in the *Deccan College Collection 1875/77*, No. 760. The Colophon of the *Nirbhayabhīma* is given in Peterson's *first Report*, App. I, p. 80. Rāmacandra seems to have mixed himself up with the intrigues about the succession to the throne, (page II) at the end of Kumārapāla's reign, and to have worked against Kumārapāla's nephew Ajayapāla. When, however, Ajayapāla came to the throne, he caused him, as Merutuṅga (*Prabandhacintāmaṇi* p. 248) relates, to be roasted alive on a copper plate. Yas'as'candra is mentioned in the *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 746; *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* p. 206, p. 223; and *Kumārapālacarita* p. 188; Bālacandra and Guṇacandra in the *Kumārapālacarita* p. 283; see also above, page 57. In the *Bṛhajjñānakośa* at Jesalmir there are fragments of *s'rī-Rāmacandra-Guṇacandraviracitā svopajña-Dravyālaṁkāraṭīkā*. After the *tṛtīyoṅkaprakās'aḥ* stands the date Saṁvat 1202. Merutuṅga, (*Prabandhacintāmaṇi* p. 230) relates an anecdote about Udayacandra, which may possibly have a historical basis. Once, we are told, he was reading the *Yogas'āstra* to the king in the presence of his teacher. When he came to the verse, III, 105: दन्तकेशनखास्थित्वग्रोम्णां ग्रहणमाकरे । he repeated the last words several times. Hemacandra asked him whether there was anything wrong in the MS. He answered that, according to the grammar, it should read °त्वग्रोम्णो as enumerations of the limbs of animals took the singular ending in the *Dvandva*. Thereupon his teacher praised him. All the MSS. have the singular in the passage in question, and the Commentary refers to the Grammar according to which the same is required. As regards Udayacandra's explanation of his teacher's Grammar, see Note 34.

95. The first verse is to be found in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 216-217, and *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 701; the second in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* p. 223 and *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 765; the third in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* p. 224 and *Kumārapālacarita* p. 188. The *Daṇḍaka* is mentioned in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* p. 238 and the half-verse which completes the one begun by the minister Kapardin, on p. 228. The description of the way in which Kumārapāla fulfilled the twelve Jaina vows, is given in the *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 187-213.

96. *Prabandhakośa* pp. 99-100:

कुमारपालेनामारी प्रारब्धायामाश्विनसुदिपक्षः समागात् । देवतानां कण्टेश्वरीप्रमुखानामतो[बो?]टिकैर्नृपो विज्ञप्तः । देव सप्तम्यां सप्त शतानि पशवः सप्त महिषा अष्टम्यामष्ट महिषा अष्टौ शतानि पशवो नवम्यां तु नव शतानि पशवो नव महिषा देवीभ्यो राज्ञा देया भवन्ति पूर्वपुरुषक्रमात् । राजा तदाकर्ण्य श्रीहेमान्तिकमगमत् । कथिता सा वार्त्ता । श्रीप्रभुभिः कर्णे एवमेवमित्युक्तम् । राजोत्थितः । भाषितास्ते । देयं दास्याम इत्युक्त्वा वहिकाक्रमेण रात्रौ देवीसदने क्षिप्ताः पशवः तालकानि दत्तीकृतानि । उपवेशितास्तेषु प्रभूता आप्तराजपुत्राः । प्रातरायातो नृपेन्द्रः । उद्घाटितानि देवीसदनद्वाराणि । मध्ये दृष्टाः पशवो रोमन्थायमाना निर्वातशय्यासुस्थाः । भूपालो जगाद । भो अबोटिका एते पशवो मयाभूम्य[मूभ्यो]दत्ताः । यद्यमूभ्योरोचि[चि]ष्यन्तैते तदाग्रसिष्यन्त । परं न ग्रस्तास्तस्मान्मा[न्मा]मूभ्यो देः[देवीभ्यः] पलं रुचितम् । भवद्भ्य एव रुचितम् । तस्मात्तूष्णीमासध्वं मा[हं] जीवान् घातयामि । स्थितास्ते विलक्षाः । मुक्ताश्छागाः । छागमूल्यसमेन तु धनेन देवीभ्यो नैवेद्यानि दापितानि ॥

Jinamaṇḍana's version is to be found in the *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 155 ff.

97. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 233 and pp. 234-35. Both the stories stand in a reverse order in the *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 190 and 191.

98. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 703 ff.; *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 237; *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 246 f.

99. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 240; *Prabandhakoṣa*, pp. 112 ff.; *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 268 ff.

100. *Kumārapālacarita*, p. 267.

101. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 731 ff; *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 223 f.; *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 188 f.

102. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 243 f.; *Prabandhakoṣa*, pp. 100 f.; *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 156 ff. and 272 ff.

103. The first story is found in the *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 213 f. The second one, which stands on pp. 267 f., at the end of the work, is in close relation to the Brahmin-legend about S'aṅkarācārya and Hemācārya, communicated by K. Forbes, *Rās Mālā*, pp. 155 f. The latter is probably only an adaptation of the Jaina legend in the Brahmin spirit.

104. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 710 ff.; *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 236 f. By ordinary palm-trees, the Phoenix sylvestris or *Kharjūra*, which is common in Western India, is probably meant; by the *S'rītālas*, the specimens of the Borassus flabelliformis, rarer in Gujarat, are probably meant.

105. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 769, ff. The remaiming *Prabandhas*, too, maintain that Kumārapāla presented his kingdom to Hemacandra. The motive for this is, however, given differently.

106. *Kumārapālacarita*, p. 146.

107. *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 211-223. At the end of the work, on p. 279, there is a further list of *Birudas*, which diverges in many points.

108. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 850 f.; *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 237 f.; *Prabandhakoṣa*, pp. 102 ff. and p. 112; *Kumārapālacarita*, p. 243 and p. 279.

109. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 852-53; *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* pp. 244 f.; *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 286 ff. As Jinamaṇḍana's account of the manner of Kumārapāla's death may possibly contain historical elements, it may be given in full. It runs (on pp. 284 f.) as follows:

ततः श्रीगुरुविरहातुरो राजा यावद् दौहित्रं प्रतापमल्लं राज्ये निवेशयति तावत् किंचिद्विकृतराजवर्गभेदोऽजयपालो भ्रातृव्यः श्रीकुमारपालदेवस्य विषमदात् । तेन विधुरितगात्रो राजा ज्ञाततत्प्रपञ्चः स्वां विषापहारशुक्तिकां कोशस्थां शीघ्रमानयतेति निजाप्तपुरुषानादिदेश । ते च तां पुराप्यजयपालगृहीतां ज्ञात्वा तूष्णीं स्थिताः । अत्रान्तरे व्याकुले समस्तराजलोके विषा-[प]हारे[र]शुक्तेरनाग[म]ह[हे]तुं ज्ञात्वा कोऽपि पपाठ ।........इत्याकर्ण्य यात[व]द् राज्[जा] विमृशति तावत् कोऽपि आसन्नस्थः । कृतकृत्योऽसि भूपाल कलिकालेऽपि भूतले । आमन्त्रयति तेन त्वां शा......विधिः । द्वयोर्लक्षं लक्षं दत्त्वा शिप्रानागमहेतुं ज्ञात्वा ।

अर्थिभ्यः कनकस्य दीपकपिशा विश्राणिताः कोटयो
वादेषु प्रतिवादिनां प्रतिहताः शास्त्रार्थगर्भा गिरः ।
उन्मान[उत्खात] प्रतिरोपितैर्नृपतिभिः सारैरिव क्रीडितं
कर्तव्यं कृतमर्थना यदि विधेस्तत्रापि सज्जा वयम् ॥

इत्युदीर्य दशधाराधनां कृत्वा गृहीतानशनो वर्ष ३० मास ८ दिवसान् २७ राज्यं कृत्वा कृतार्थी कृतपुरुषार्थः

सर्वज्ञं हृदि संस्मरन् गुरुमपि श्रीहेमचन्द्रप्रभुं
धर्मं तद्भवितं च कल्मषमषीप्रक्षालनापुष्कलं ।
व्योमाक्ष्यर्यम १२३० वत्सरे विस[ष]लहर्युत्सर्पिमूर्च्छाभरो
मृत्वावाप कुमारपालनृपतिः स ध्य[व्य]न्तराधीशताम् ॥

The omitted line contains a hopelessly mutilated Prakrit verse.

INDEX.

ERRATA.

Page		line					
Page	5	line	7	*for*	*Kumāravālcariya*	*read*	*Kumāravālacariya*
,,	7	,,	27	,,	furions	,,	furious
,,	,,	,,	33	,,	pursuation	,,	remonstrance
,,	9	,,	8	,,	Srīmālī	,,	Śrīmālī
,,	14	,,	28	,,	Kumudcandra	,,	Kumudacandra
,,	,,	,,	44	,,	aftar	,,	after
,,	16	,,	39	,,	date	,,	data
,,	18	,,	26	,,	matrics	,,	metrics
,,	20	,,	33	,,	purturbed	,,	perturbed
,,	23	,,	25	,,	Māhavīra	,,	Mahāvīra
,,	26	,,	29	,,	seventeenth	,,	seventh
,,	27	last line		,,	materials of	,,	metrical
,,	33	,,		,,	as	,,	above
,,	35	*after* line 13 *add:* indicate that Hemacandra had always been in connection with Udayana's family. Thus all the *Prabandhas*					
,,	36	line	11	*after*	the Court-Pandit	*add*	of Jayasiṁha
,,	,,	,,	13	*for*	parhaps	*read*	perhaps
,,	37	,,	41	,,	rediated	,,	radiated
,,	45	,,	41	,,	Tribhuvanpāla...	,,	Tribhuvanapāla...
,,	47	,,	13	,,	after	,,	before
,,	49	,,	33	,,	*Pramāṇamimāṁsā*	,,	*Pramāṇamīmāṁsā*
,,	50	,,	8	,,	signature	,,	colophon
,,	51	,,	18	,,	merchant	,,	merchants
,,	,,	,,	20	,,	"Scholar"	,,	"scholars"
,,	52	ll.	6 & 29	,,	Kunteśvarī	,,	Kaṇṭeśvarī
,,	53	,,	19 & 22	,,	Dāhala	,,	Ḍāhala
,,	54	l.	15	,,	Kunteśvarī	,,	Kaṇṭeśvarī
,,	56	l.	2	,,	register	,,	registers
,,	,,	,,	6	,,	title	,,	titles
,,	,,	,,	16	,,	king Dāhala	,,	king of Ḍāhala

N. B.—As mentioned in the Preface, I am thankful to Professor Dr. M. Winternitz for indicating the misprints in this essay.

M. P.

SINGHI JAINA SERIES

A COLLECTION OF CRITICAL EDITIONS OF MOST IMPORTANT CANONICAL, PHILOSOPHICAL, HISTORICAL, LITERARY, NARRATIVE ETC. WORKS OF JAINA LITERATURE IN PRĀKRIT, SANSKRIT, APABHRAMŚA AND OLD VERNACULAR LANGUAGES; AND STUDIES BY COMPETENT RESEARCH SCHOLARS.

Works already published.

1. PRABANDHACINTĀMAṆI of MERŪTUNGĀCĀRYA

Part I—A critical Edition of the original Text in Sanskrit with various readings based on the most reliable MSS.; An Appendix; An alphabetical Index of all Sanskrit, Prākrit and Apabhraṃs'a verses occurring in the text and the appendix; A short Introduction in Hindi describing the MSS. and materials used for the construction of the text along with plates. (Price Rs. 3-12.)

2. PURĀTANAPRABANDHA SAṄGRAHA

A collection of many old Prabandhas similar and analogous to the matter in the Prabandha-cintāmani; indices of the verses and proper names; a short introduction in Hindi describing the MSS. and materials used in preparing this part, along with plates. (Price Rs. 5.)

3. PRABANDHAKOS'A of RĀJAS'EKHARA SŪRI

Part I—Text in Sanskrit with variants, appendices and alphabetical indices of stanzas and all proper names. etc. (Price Rs. 4.)

4. VIVIDHATĪRTHAKALPA of JINAPRABHA SŪRI

Text in Sanskrit and Prakrit with variants, and an alfabetical index of all proper names. etc. (Price Rs. 4-4.)

5. LIFE of HEMACANDRĀCĀRYA by PROFESSOR Dr. G. BÜHLER, VIENNA

Transleted from the original German by Dr. MANILAL PATEL, Ph. D. with a Foreword by Professor Dr. M. WINTERNITZ, Ph. D., Professor of Indology and Ethnology at the German University of Prague (Czechoslovakia). (Price Rs. 3-8.)

TO BE HAD FROM

SAÑCĀLAKA, SIṄGHĪ JAINA GRANTHAMĀLĀ

BHĀRATINIVAS,
ELLIS BRIDGE
AHMEDABAD. (GUJRAT)



SIṄGHI SADAN,
48, GARIYAHAT ROAD,
BALLYGUNGE, CALCUTTA

Published by Babu Rajendrasinha Singhi, for Singhi Jaina Jñānapītha, Ballygunge, Calcutta.

Printed by Ramchandra Yesu Shedge, at the Nirnaya Sagar Press, 26-28, Kolbhat Street, Bombay.